

# REVUE DES ÉTUDES ARMÉNIENNES

NOUVELLE SÉRIE

TOME VI

REA 6(1969) pp. 233-281

DIRECTEUR

E. BENVENISTE

SECRÉTAIRE DE LA RÉDACTION

H. BERBÉRIAN

Publié avec le concours de la Fondation Calouste Gulbenkian

DÉPOSITAIRE :

LIBRAIRIE C. KLINCKSIECK

11, RUE DE LILLE, 11

75 — PARIS (7°)

## THE THIRD-CENTURY ARMENIAN ARSACIDS

### A CHRONOLOGICAL AND GENEALOGICAL COMMENTARY

1. The Parthian Arsacids reached the throne of Armenia <sup>1</sup> immediately after the extinction of the national Artaxiad Dynasty, when, c.A.D. 12, the ex-Great King <sup>2</sup> Vonones I succeeded the last Artaxiad, Queen Erato <sup>3</sup>. However, he failed to found a dynasty. For some hundred and sixty-five years after him, thirteen sovereigns succeeded one another in Armenia, eight of whom were indeed Arsacid cadets whom the accident of political circumstances, in the ceaseless Romano-Iranian struggle over Caucasia, placed on the Armenian throne and who were related to one another as members of the Imperial House of Iran, without forming a Royal House of Armenia <sup>4</sup>. The others, Roman candidates all, were members of the neighbouring Pontic, Iberian, Judaean, and Emesan dynasties <sup>5</sup>. An attempt to combine both Roman and Iranian allegiance was made in the case of two Arsacid princes, Tiridates I, as stipulated in the Treaty of Rhandea

<sup>1</sup> For the Armenian history of the period under discussion, see H. MANANDIAN, *K'nnakan tesut'yun Hay solovrdi patmut'yan*, II/1 (Erevan, 1957) and, for the period prior to Tiridates I, *ibidem*, I (Erevan, 1945); R. GROUSSET, *Histoire de l'Arménie* (Paris, 1947); P. ASDOURIAN, *Die politische Beziehungen zwischen Armenien und Rom* (Venice, 1911), whose command of the sources for Roman history is impressive, though his chronology of Armenian history is, as can now be seen, defective. For the social and cultural background, cf. TOUMANOFF, *Studies in Christian Caucasian History* (Washington, 1963), I, II, III.

<sup>2</sup> « Great King » — μέγας βασιλεὺς *par excellence* — is used throughout to designate the Iranian emperor.

<sup>3</sup> N. DEBEVOISE, *A Political History of Parthia* (Chicago, 1938), pp. 152-153; GROUSSET, *Histoire*, pp. 104-105.

<sup>4</sup> They were Orodes (c.15/3-c.18, 35), Arsaces I (34-35), Tiridates I (54-60, 63-75), Sanatruces (75-110), Axidares (110-113), Parthamasiris (113-114), Vologases I (117-140), Aurelius Pacorus (161-163): DEBEVOISE, *Parthia*, pp. 153-249; MANANDIAN, *K'nnakan tes. II/1*, 5-74.

<sup>5</sup> Zeno-Artaxias III, of the dynasty of Pontus (18-34), Mithridates, of the dynasty of Iberia (35-37, 41-51), Radamistus, his nephew (51-c. 54), Tigranes VI, of the dynasty of Herod (60-61/2), Sohaemus, of the dynasty of Emesa (140-160, 163-185): DEBEVOISE, *loc. cit.*, MANANDIAN, *loc. cit.*

A.D. 63<sup>6</sup>, and Vologases I (117-140)<sup>7</sup>, but it proved on the whole a failure. Only with Vologases II, in 180, did the Arsacid Dynasty of Armenia — the Armenian Arsacids —, properly speaking, begin, remaining on the throne until 428.

The chronology, and indirectly also genealogy, of the Armenian Arsacids between 180 and 428 have been the object of the important studies by the late Hakob Manandian<sup>8</sup> and Fr P. Ananian<sup>9</sup>. They introduced order in Armenian historiography where, in regard to this subject, chaos had previously reigned. The scope of the present study is, therefore, merely to suggest a few addenda to the conclusions of these two scholars, which will be made on the basis of some Iranian and Georgian material which seems to have escaped their attention. Much of what will be said here will repeat what they have said; but this repetition will be necessary for the sake of the unity of the whole. On the other hand, it is not proposed here to go beyond the third century, beyond, that is, the reign of the first Christian King — Tiridates the Great.

2. The sources for the period we are interested in are not numerous and at all events not very communicative. The sole exception is presented by the circumstantial account given by the History ascribed to Moses of Chorene (Movsēs Xorenac'i) and purporting to have been written in the fifth century, when it appears in reality to have been compiled in the middle of the eighth<sup>10</sup>. Ps. Moses has preserved, for all that, much that is unquestionably ancient Armenian historical tradition. However, his chronological indications are greatly impaired by an ill-judged introduction of data on Roman and Iranian history which, in addition to not being synchronous with one another, are almost invariably given a wrong place in Armenian history<sup>11</sup>; by a telescoping of Armenian history itself, which will be examined presently; and by regnal years which appear inexact because, as will be seen, in part applied to wrong sovereigns.

<sup>6</sup> DEBEVOISE, *Parthia*, pp. 191-196; GROUSSET, *Histoire*, pp. 108-109.

<sup>7</sup> DEBEVOISE, *op. cit.*, pp. 237, 242-244; GROUSSET, *op. cit.*, pp. 110-111.

<sup>8</sup> MANANDIAN, *K'nnakan tes*. II/1.

<sup>9</sup> P. ANANIAN, « La data e le circostanze della consecrazione di S. Gregorio Illuminatore », *Le Muséon*, 74 (1961), 43-73, 317-360.

<sup>10</sup> *Srboy hawn meroy Movsēsi Xorenac'woy patmut'ium Hayoc'* (Tiflis, 1913). For a discussion of his date see my *Studies*, pp. 326-334.

<sup>11</sup> *Infra*, Appendix A.

The same telescoping and apparently wrong regnal years are observable in one of Ps. Moses's sources, the *Primary History of Armenia*, which may possibly date from the end of the fourth or from the fifth century<sup>12</sup>. Another of Ps. Moses's sources, the Gregorian Cycle of the fifth century presents an extensive account of the third century and of the beginning of the fourth, though one less supplied with chronological details than that of Ps. Moses, and manifests the same telescoping of history<sup>13</sup>.

The other Armenian sources yield mere *obiter dicta*. They are the fifth-century works of Faustus Buzand (P'awstos Buzand)<sup>14</sup> and of Eliseus (Elišē)<sup>15</sup>, and the synchronistic table found in the seventh-century History of Eusebius (Sebēos)<sup>16</sup>. This table represents a compi-

<sup>12</sup> It forms Chapter I of Eusebius (Sebēos), and has been referred to as 'Ps. Agathangelus'. Cf. N. MARR, 'O načal'noj istorii Armenii Anonima', *Vizantijskij Vremennik*, 1 (1894); N. ADONTZ, 'Načal'naja istorija Armenii' u Sebeosa v otnošenijax k trudam Moiseja Xorenakago i Fausta Vizantijskago', *ibid.*, 8 (1901); MANANDIAN, 'Načal'naja istorija Armenii' Mar-Abasa', *Palestinskij Sbornik*, 2 (64-65, 1956), 69-86; *Studies*, pp. 306-316.

<sup>13</sup> The Gregorian Cycle has reached us in two recensions. Recension I or the Agathangelus is formed of the Armenian Agathangelus and the Greek Agathangelus (translated from the Armenian). Recension II or the Life of St Gregory is formed of the Greek Life (translated from the now lost Armenian) and the Arabic Life (translated in part from the Greek Life and in part based on the Agathangelus). The Arm. Agathangelus is known to the fifth-century Lazarus of P'arpi, was brought, according to the seventh-century Eusebius, to the Council of Ctesiphon of 590/612, and is largely quoted in the *Knik' hawatoy*, a florilegium of c. 612/628. The Gk Agathangelus appears to have been translated in the years 464/468 (P. PEETERS, 'S. Grégoire l'Illuminateur dans le calendrier lapidaire de Naples', *Analecta Bollandiana*, 60 [1942], 104-112). The Arabic Life appears not to be anterior to the ninth century; but the Gk Life has the indications of being a very ancient version, and according to Ananian (*Data e circ.*, pp. 317-324) more ancient than Recension I, which would make it close enough in time to the Conversion and to the reign of Tiridates the Great, to whose secretary Agathangelus Recension I has been traditionally ascribed. Cf. G. GABITTE, *Documents pour l'étude du livre d'Agathange* (Vatican City, 1946). The Arm. Agathangelus is used here in the Tiflis ed. 1914; the Gk Agathangelus, in V. LANGLOIS, *Collection des historiens anciens et modernes de l'Arménie*, I (Paris, 1867); Recension II, in GABITTE, *Documents*. Cf. *Studies*, p. 16.

<sup>14</sup> P'awstosi Buzandac'woy patmut'wn Hayoc' (Venice, 1933).

<sup>15</sup> Elišēi patmut'wn Vardananc' (Tiflis, 1913).

<sup>16</sup> Patmut'wn Sebēosi episkoposi i Herakln (Tiflis, 1913). The synchronistic table forms Chapter II of this work, possibly an independent source incorporated by Eusebius and unaltered, to serve, together with the *Primary History*, as a proem to his own history of the contemporary 'time of troubles'. I have not been sufficiently convinced by recent arguments in favour of attributing this History to the seventh-century Xosro-

lation of data quite obviously culled at random from several sources, some items repeating or contradicting one another. Down to the time of Tiridates the Great, these synchronisms will be shown to be for the most part exact, and their errors that spring to the eye merely apparent, when one takes the trouble to examine them critically. But for the history that follows, they are appallingly corrupt<sup>17</sup>. The tenth- or, more likely, eleventh-century History of Uxtanēs<sup>18</sup> carries little authority, though its version of the Armenian historical tradition may be of occasional worth; while the romance ascribed to the fourth-century Syrian Zenobius (Zenob), but which cannot have been set to writing before the eighth century, and the tenth-century *Genealogy of St Gregory and Life of St Nerses* by the Priest Mesrop carry none<sup>19</sup>. Chronological data of the twelfth-century work of Samuel of Ani (Anec'i), on the other hand, deserve attention<sup>20</sup>, as does the evidence of the *Narratio de rebus Armeniae*, an eighth-century Greek translation from the Armenian<sup>21</sup>.

Only *obiter dicta* are likewise offered by the non-Armenian sources. Included among these are: three contemporary Sassanian documents — the trilingual (Pahlavi, Middle Persian, and Greek) inscription of the Great King Sapor I, of 260/71, on the tower called Kaabah of Zoroaster, at Naqš-i-Rustam, in the province of Fārs; the Middle Persian inscription of the High Priest Kartīr, of 275/93, on the same Kaabah of

vik, instead of Eusebius (for which see G. ARGARIAN, « Remarques sur l'Histoire de Sébéos », *Revue des Études arméniennes*, 1 1964, 203-215), to alter the traditional designation of this work. Fortunately, the date of this important source is in no way involved; though, in view of the above doubt, the author's name should be preceded by a « Pseudo ».

<sup>17</sup> *Infra*, Appendix B.

<sup>18</sup> *Patmut' iwn bažanman Vrac' ew Hayoc' (Valarsapat, 1871)*. For the dating of this work, see PEETERS, « Sainte Sousanik, martyre en Arméno-Géorgie », *Analecta Bollandiana*, 53 (1935), 247-260.

<sup>19</sup> For the dating of Ps. Zenobius, see M. ABEGHIAN, *Istorija drevnearmjanskij literatury*, I (Erevan, 1948), 345-351. The Priest Mesrop, while repeating the data of earlier sources, is highly untrustworthy in what he superadds, especially in connexion with the social aspect of Armenian history: N. ADONTZ, *Armenija v épozhu Justiniana* (St Petersburg, 1908), pp. 239-240; *Studies*, p. 229.

<sup>20</sup> Available to me in the Latin translation of J. Zohrab and A. Mai, MIGNE, *Patrologia graeca*, 19 (1857): *Samuelis presbyteri Aniensis Temporum usque ad suam aetatem ratio*.

<sup>21</sup> *Διήγησις*, ed. G. GARITTE, *La Narratio de rebus Armeniae (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, 132, Subsidia, 4 [Louvain, 1952])*.

Zoroaster<sup>22</sup>; and the bilingual (Pahlavi and Middle Persian) inscription of the Great King Narses, of 293/4, on the tower of Paikuli, also in Fārs<sup>23</sup> —; the contemporary Greek historical works of Cassius Dio (d. 235)<sup>24</sup> and of Herodian (d. 250)<sup>25</sup>; the contemporary or near-contemporary Latin writings forming the *Historia Augusta*<sup>26</sup>; the eighth-century Georgian historical work of Leontius of Ruisi (Leonti Mroveli), embodying the Iberian (East Georgian) historical tradition<sup>27</sup>; and the information preserved by the twelfth-century Byzantine chronicler Zonaras<sup>28</sup>. One may also mention here the Armenian *History of the Councils*, attributed to John of Ojun (Ojnee'i), and *Letter of Photius*; the Latin Panegyrics of Maximin I and Constantine, Eutropius, Festus, Aurelius Victor, Ammianus Marcellinus; the Greek Eusebius of Caesarea, Zosimus, Evagrius; and the Syriac *Arbela Chronicle* and Elias bar Šināyā.

3. Not the least of the causes of the historiographical chaos, alluded to earlier, is what I have called telescoping of history which marks Ps. Moses and his sources, the *Primary History* and the Gregorian Cycle. This telescoping may well have been an integral part of the ancient Armenian Epos of the Iranian War, fragments of which are found in, precisely, the Agathangelus version of the Gregorian Cycle and Ps. Moses, as well as in Faustus and Eusebius<sup>29</sup>. Accordingly, Ps. Moses shows, between 180 and 325 and beyond, the Armenian

<sup>22</sup> Ed. and transl. M. SPRENGLING, *Third Century Iran : Sapor and Kartir* (Chicago, 1953), pp. 10-20, plates 1-12 (Sapor I's inscription); pp. 46-83, plates 13-18 (Kartir's inscription).

<sup>23</sup> Ed. and transl. E. HEEZFELD, *Paikuli : Monument and Inscription of the Early History of the Sasanian Empire*, I (Berlin, 1924), 94-119; cf. the reconstruction of a few lines of the text in W. HENNING, « A Farewell to the Khagan of the Aq-Aqatārān », *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 14 (1954), 501-522.

<sup>24</sup> *Historiae romanae*, ed. V.P. BOISSEVAIN (Berlin, 1955).

<sup>25</sup> *Ab excessu D. Marci libri VII*, ed. K. STAVENHAGEN (Leipzig, 1922).

<sup>26</sup> *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, ed. and transl. Loeb Classical Library, containing, *inter alia*, the Lives of Septimius Severus, Caracalla, Macrinus, Severus Alexander, the three Gordians, Maximus and Balbinus, the two Valerians, the Thirty Tyrants, Aurelian, Tacitus, Probus, and Carus, ascribed to Aelius Spartianus, Julius Capitolinus, Aelius Lampridius, Trebellius Pollio, and Flavius Vopiscus.

<sup>27</sup> *C'xovreba k'art'ueł'a mep'e't'a*, ed. S. QAUXO'İSVILI, *K'art'lis C'xovreba*, I (Tiflis, 1955), 3-138. For the dating of this work, see *Studies*, pp. 24-25.

<sup>28</sup> *Joannis Zonarae Annales*, ed. MIGNE, *Patrologia graeca*, 134 (1864).

<sup>29</sup> ABEGHIAN, *Istoriya*, pp. 156-162.

throne as occupied by only three kings succeeding one another : Vologases (Valarš) <sup>30</sup> [II], who became King of Armenia in 180, his son Chosroes (Xosrov), and the latter's son Tiridates (Trdat) the Great who died after the Council of Nicaea. The *Primary History* likewise speaks of those three kings for the corresponding period, while the Gregorian Cycle mentions only Chosroes and his son Tiridates. That the span of over 145 years should have contained only three successive reigns, each lasting on the average for about half a century, though not perhaps wholly impossible, is indeed hardly probable. However, an examination of the texts of the Gregorian Cycle and of Ps. Moses, as well as other sources, will make it difficult to escape the impression that each of the last two kings is endowed with two different sets of circumstances, which are not reconcilable. Thus Tiridates the Great, who as a child was whisked off by loyal men to the Roman Empire, upon the assassination of his father <sup>31</sup>, can hardly be the same as the King Tiridates of Armenia, who in 252 fled to the Empire before an Iranian invasion, being a fully grown man, for his sons went over to the invaders <sup>32</sup>. Nor can Tiridates the Great, who (as will be seen, 14) never fought against Iran after his accession, really be the King Tiridates who is said to have spent his whole reign fighting Iran <sup>33</sup>. Likewise, King Chosroes is described as having victoriously warred on Iran in two campaigns, in two consecutive years, one against Ctesiphon, resulting in much booty, the other in Assyria, involving a struggle with Arabs <sup>34</sup>. This is an obvious memory of the

<sup>30</sup> Vologases II is known in the Armenian historical tradition as Valarš (Ps. MOSES, 2.65, 67), whereas both the mythical first Arsacid and Vologases III are given the name of Valaršak (*ibid.*, 2.3 etc.; FAUSTUS, 5.37, 38, 44; Ps. MOSES, 3.41). The latter form must be a diminutive, possibly influenced by the name Aršak (Arsaces). Valarš is the customary Armenian rendering of the Iranian Valagaš (F. JUSTI, *Iranische Namenbuch* [Marburg, 1895], p. 346), which name is regularly rendered in Classical sources as Vologases, and variants : *ibid.*, pp. 344-346. — Classical forms, when traditionally established, are given preference here over local forms of proper names. For one thing, the earliest sources relating to Caucasian onomastics are Classical and Iranian, far antedating the appearance of local sources; and, secondly, the use of more familiar forms precludes exoticism which seldom serves clarity; cf. *Studies*, p. 28.

<sup>31</sup> ARM. AGATHANGELUS, 3.36; GK AGATHANGELUS, 3.16; ELISEUS, 3.54 (p. 92); cf. Ps. MOSES, 2.76.

<sup>32</sup> ZONARAS, 12.21.

<sup>33</sup> ARM. AGATHANGELUS, 12.132; GK AGATHANGELUS, 57.

<sup>34</sup> ARM. AGATHANGELUS, 1.19, 23; GK AGATHANGELUS, 10, 12.

Iranian war of Septimius Severus with its two campaigns : against Ctesiphon in 198, accompanied by a great plunder, and against Hatra, in the immediate vicinity of Assyria, in 199-200, which brought the invaders into conflict with Arab cavalry <sup>35</sup>. In this war, a King Chosroes of Armenia must thus have participated, but he cannot, for chronological reasons, have been Chosroes the father of Tiridates the Great. The latter, for the same reasons, can only have taken part in the Iranian war of Carus in 283, which indeed also brought the invaders to the gates of Ctesiphon and secured Roman control of Mesopotamia, but left Assyria untouched and involved neither any appreciable, and therefore memorable, booty nor any conflict with Arabs <sup>36</sup>.

One cannot, thus, escape the further impression that King Chosroes and his son King Tiridates the Great, as remembered by the Armenian historical tradition and Epos, preserved in the *Primary History*, the Gregorian Cycle, and Ps. Moses, are composite figures, each a fusion of at least two kings named Chosroes and two other kings named Tiridates. This fusion must have been due, in the first place, to onomastic similarities, to each Tiridates's being the son of a Chosroes. Then, the two sets of circumstances, just examined, besides their irreconcilable differences, contained also essential similarities, — similarities sufficiently pronounced to contribute to the fusion. Thus, while the war against Iran (and Ctesiphon) waged by Septimius Severus in 197-200 must have occurred in the reign, and with the participation, of the earlier King Chosroes, that waged by Carus in 283 must have taken place during the reign of, and in co-operation with, the later King Chosroes. And both kings named Tiridates were obliged to flee, albeit in different circumstances and at different times, to the Empire.

It is, as a matter of fact, Ps. Moses himself, who in his treatment of the Sassanids of the third and fourth centuries, unwittingly confirms

<sup>35</sup> DIO, 76 (75). 9-13; SPARTIANUS, *Severus*, 16; cf. S. N. MILLER, 'The Army and the Imperial House', *The Cambridge Ancient History* [hereafter CAH], XII (1935), 16-17; DEBEVOISE, *Parthia*, pp. 260-262.

<sup>36</sup> VOPISCUS, *Carus*, 8.1-2. Armenia's participation in this war seems also indicated by SYNESIUS, in *De regno*, 12 (MIGNE, *Patrologia graeca*, 66 [1864 col. 1081], where Carus is said to have dismissed the Great King's embassy, after having reached Armenia's mountain-passes (ἐπειδὴ δὲ πρὸς ταῖς ὑπερβολαῖς τῶν Ἀρμενίων γενέσθαι) and with his own eyes beheld the fields of Iran.





graphy <sup>42</sup>. Its manifestation in Armenian history can be rendered schematically as follows :

*Arsacids according to  
the Armenian historical tradition*

Vologases II  
|  
Chosroes  
|  
Tiridates the Great

*Historical Arsacids*

Vologases II  
|  
Chosroes I  
|  
Tiridates II  
|  
Chosroes II  
|  
Tiridates the Great

The link between Vologases II and Chosroes I and that between Chosroes II and Tiridates the Great are attested to by the Armenian sources ; that between Chosroes I and Tiridates II — as will be seen — by the *Historia Augusta* ; and that between Tiridates II and Chosroes II may be assumed on the basis of the naming pattern. It will be seen that another Arsacid king and two Sassanid kings reigned in third-century Armenia. We may now attempt the chronology and genealogy of the Armenian Arsacids, from Vologases II to Tiridates the Great, as revealed in the context of the history of the times.

4. The lists of the earlier Armenian monarchs, as found in the *Primary History* and in Ps. Moses, present an extraordinarily embroiled combination of memories of the Urartian, proto-Armenian, Orontid, Artaxiad, and Iranian Arsacid rulers of Armenia, with those of the Scythian invaders of Urartu and of the Kings of Osroene thrown in. There are considerable differences between the two sources. Although separate threads of historical memory, when unravelled, can be shown to contain valuable historical evidence, the tissue taken as a whole is worthless <sup>43</sup>. No less fantastic is the series of the Arsacid Great Kings given by these two sources. Both sources agree in making

<sup>42</sup> Cf. a similar occurrence in Iberian historiography : *Studies*, pp. 394-397.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 108, 283-85, 294-297.

Vologases II of Armenia a son of a King Tigranes (Tigran), son of a King Artaxias (Artašēs), son of King Sanatruces (Sanatruk) <sup>44</sup>. While the reference to King Artaxias and King Tigranes is hopelessly anachronistic <sup>45</sup>, that to the earliest of the three Kings seems to be one to Sanatruces who reigned in Armenia in the years 75-110 <sup>46</sup>. His son, however, was Vologases I, indeed King of Armenia in 117-140 <sup>47</sup>, and not at all Artaxias. When next one examines the series of the Great Kings, as given in the two sources, it will be noticed that, while the Great King Artabanus V's immediate predecessor, likewise Vologases, is called Valaršak in the *Primary History* and Valarš in Ps. Moses <sup>48</sup>, his third predecessor, whose name was also Vologases, is called Artašir by the *Primary History* and Artašēs by Ps. Moses <sup>49</sup>. This seems to show that in some sources the name Artašir/Artašēs <sup>50</sup> was substituted for Valarš, and this would account for the name given to the son of Sanatruces. That Vologases II of Armenia may have been a grandson of Vologases I, is not impossible; that the son of the one and the father of the other was named Tigranes, is, on the other hand, quite improbable. Tigranes was an Artaxiad name *par excellence*, exactly as was Artaxias, and one unknown among the Arsacids. It would seem, accordingly, that the genealogical link between these two Kings of Armenia was as improbable as the name in question, being artificially introduced into the series of rulers by the Armenian historical tradition so as to establish a connexion between these two kings.

Another version of the origin of Vologases II is provided by the Gregorian Cycle, which, however, does not mention him. But the Greek Agathangelus refers to Chosroes I of Armenia as a brother of Artabanus V, who was a son of Vologases IV of Iran <sup>51</sup>. This version,

<sup>44</sup> *Prim. Hist.*, p. 16; Ps. MOSES, 2.34-37; 2.37, 44-56; 2.64; 2.65.

<sup>45</sup> The last Artaxias was Zeno-Artaxias III (18-34) and the last Tigranes, Tigranes VI (60-61/2); cf. *supra*, n. 5.

<sup>46</sup> *Supra*, n. 4.

<sup>47</sup> *Supra*, nn. 4, 7.

<sup>48</sup> *Prim. Hist.*, p. 15; Ps. MOSES, 2.65, 69.

<sup>49</sup> *Prim. Hist.*, p. 15; Ps. MOSES, 2.53, 69.

<sup>50</sup> Artašir is a derivation of the Old Persian Artaxšaθrā; Artašēs, a purely Armenian variant of the same: JUSTI, *Namenbuch*, pp. 34-36; *Studies*, p. 285 and n. 27.

<sup>51</sup> GK AGATHANGELUS, 9 (pp. 113, 115), 10 (p. 116). Oddly, the Arm. Agathangelus nowhere calls Chosroes a brother of Artabanus.

if exact, must mean that the father of the brothers Artabanus and Chosroes was at first King of Armenia (Vologases II) and subsequently became Great King (Vologases IV), leaving the throne of Armenia to Chosroes. His eldest son Vologases V succeeded him as Great King in 207/8, but c. 213 was faced with the revolt of his brother Artabanus, then King of Media, the result of which was a division of the empire between these two brothers <sup>52</sup>.

This version is highly plausible. The throne of Armenia was, in the first and second centuries, invariably reserved for the Great King's nearest kin. Thus, Vonones (c. 12-15/6) was himself a former Great King (1), and Vologases II, as implied in this version, later succeeded as one. Of the remaining eight Arsacids who occupied the throne of Armenia, five were sons of Great Kings; two, a Great King's nephew and great nephew, respectively; and one was of unknown parentage <sup>53</sup>. Chosroes I, according to this version, was the sixth among the sons of Great Kings who became Kings of Armenia; and it is highly improbable that he was more distant kin. It was an established practice, moreover, that while an elder Arsacid prince (like, precisely, Artabanus V) was King of Media, a younger one (like Chosroes I) was King of Armenia <sup>54</sup>. It is to this that the Agathangelus must be referring when stating that Chosroes I occupied the second place in the Iranian Monarchy <sup>55</sup>. This statement alone is worth the Greek Agathangelus's use of the word «brother». Now, Vologases II is said by Ps. Moses to have become King of Armenia in the 32nd year of the Great King Vologases, his namesake, who must be Vologases III (148-192). Accordingly, if in this instance the chronological evidence of Ps. Moses can be trusted — and it appears concordant with the Agathangelus version — Vologases became King of Armenia in 180 (148 + 32). In 191, he rose in revolt

<sup>52</sup> DEBEVOISE, *Parthia*, pp. 263, 265-269.

<sup>53</sup> Accordingly, Orodes and Arsaces I were sons of Artabanus III; Tiridates I, son of Vonones II; Sanatruces, nephew of Osroes; Axidares and Parthamasiris, sons of Pacorus II (anti-Great King); Vologases I, son of Sanatruces; and Aurelius Pacorus, of unknown parentage. For the Arsacid genealogical data, I follow DEBEVOISE, *Parthia*.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. TACITUS, *Annales*, 15.4: — the throne of Iran ranked first, that of Media second, and that of Armenia third; but of course, among the vassal thrones, the Armenian ranked second. A good illustration is provided by the children of Vonones II (c. 51): the eldest son was the Great King Vologases I (51/2-79/80), the second Pacorus was King of Media, and the third Tiridates, King of Armenia (54-60, 63-75).

<sup>55</sup> ARM. AGATHANGELUS, 1.18; GK AGATHANGELUS, 9 (p. 115).

against Vologases III (with whom his kinship is not specified by the sources, though he may well have been his son), who disappears from the sources in 192, and became Great King Vologases IV <sup>56</sup>. Thus, the year 191 may be the date of the accession of Chosroes I to the Armenian throne. It does not seem unreasonable to accept — at least as a working hypothesis — this version of the origin of Vologases II of Armenia and the chronology it implies <sup>57</sup>. And, as we shall see (15), the Iberian historical tradition offers evidence to confirm it.

5. The Great King Vologases IV had to sustain the war of the Emperor Septimius Severus, to which reference has already been made (3). In the course of it Ctesiphon was taken and plundered in 198 <sup>58</sup> and Hatra twice unsuccessfully besieged in 199-200 <sup>59</sup>. It is to this war, as has been noted (3), that the Agathangelus quite unmistakably refers when relating Chosroes I's conflict with Iran, even though erroneously and anachronistically motivating it by the desire to avenge the overthrow of Artabanus V by Artasir the Sassanid <sup>60</sup>. To those who were putting to writing the historical memories of Armenia the brother of Artabanus V quite naturally appeared as the best possible avenger of his blood, so they confused Chosroes I's participation in the war of 197-200 with the conflict with Artasir in which Chosroes's successor was engaged, as will be seen (7).

All this means that the King of Armenia was once again, as stipulated in the Treaty of Rhandea, the Emperor's ally and «friend», i.e., vassal, in the war of 197-200, a war that was waged against his own father. This alliance of Armenia and Rome is attested to by Herodian <sup>61</sup>. Now the *mores* of the later Arsacids made of warfare between brothers, or between fathers and sons, a common enough thing; and, in fact, a brother of Vologases IV actually accompanied the Emperor on this campaign <sup>62</sup>. The additional participation in it of Chosroes, as

<sup>56</sup> DEBEVOISE, *Parthia*, p. 255.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. MAREWART (Marquart), *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte von Iran*, II (Leipzig, 1905), 227.

<sup>58</sup> DIO, 76 (75).9; SPARTIANUS, *Severus*, 16. — Plunder seems to have been the chief reason for the sack of Ctesiphon: DIO, *ibid.*, 9.4; *Severus*, 16.5; HERODIAN, 3.9. cf. MILLER, CAH XII, 16 (the war began in the summer of 197); DEBEVOISE, *Parthia*, pp. 255-261.

<sup>59</sup> DIO, 76 (75).10-13; SPARTIANUS, *Severus*, 16; cf. MILLER, CAH XII, 17 (places the conclusion of the war in 199); DEBEVOISE, *Parthia*, pp. 260-262.

<sup>60</sup> ARM. AGATHANGELUS, 1-2; GK AGATHANGELUS, 9-15.

<sup>61</sup> HERODIAN, 3.9.

<sup>62</sup> DIO 76(75).9.2. for his being confused with Tiridates of Armenia. 7.79

an ally of Rome, need therefore occasion no surprise. In the nature of things, he would have had no choice but to join the obviously winning side, thus preventing war from spreading to his kingdom; and, as will be seen (7), he even received in recompense Roman annual subsidies and possibly also domains in Cappadocia. He appears, moreover, to have accompanied the Emperor on his sight-seeing tour of Egypt after the war<sup>63</sup>, for an inscription found in Thebes proclaims that «Chosroes the Armenian, beholding, admired»<sup>64</sup>.

6. For a decade and a half there was peace. Then difficulties arose, both foreign and domestic. The new Emperor, Antoninus Caracalla, began a new Eastern war; and the King of Armenia, whom it is reasonable to suppose to have been still Chosroes I, was quarrelling with his sons, thus inviting an interference of the same Emperor. This interference, the nature of which will be examined presently, has been dated as prior to Caracalla's Eastern war, which began in 215<sup>65</sup>. Actually, the text of Cassius Dio, which alone mentions the affair, does not warrant this dating. As part of his lengthy, and unfavourable, character sketch of Caracalla<sup>66</sup>, Dio gives several instances of his behaviour in the field of international relations<sup>67</sup> and, among them, two indicative of his trickery: he invited Abgarus, King of Osroene to visit him, and then imprisoned him and took control of the kingdom<sup>68</sup>; and he, likewise, invited the King of Armenia, who was engaged in quarrels with his sons, to visit him, in order to mediate in this matter, and then imprisoned him and sought to control Armenia, where, however, he was met with armed resistance<sup>69</sup>. Only much

<sup>63</sup> For which see DIO, *lib. cit.*, 13; SPARTIANUS, *Severus*, 17.1-4.

<sup>64</sup> Χοσρόης Ἀρμένιος ἰδὼν ἐθαύμασα: A. BÖCKH and FRANZ, *Corpus inscriptionum graecarum*, III (1853), 394, No 4821; cf. J. A. LETRONNE, *Recueil des inscriptions grecques et latines de l'Égypte*, II (Paris, 1848), 311. — The use of an ethnic adjective for «(King) of» a given country is common enough among the ancient writers; cf., e.g., APPIAN, *Syr.*, 11.2.10; *Mithr.* 12.3.15; 12. 10. 67; 12. 16.106 (where the Kings of Epirus, Armenia, and Commagene are designated as «the Epirot», «the Armenian», and «the Commagenian», respectively).

<sup>65</sup> MILLER, *CAH XII*, 49; DEBEVOISE, *Parthia*, p. 263.

<sup>66</sup> DIO, 78 (77).1-18. Some purely historical notices are interwoven in this sketch.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, 12.1-3.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, 12.1.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, 12.1-2.

later <sup>70</sup>, does Dio offer a few glimpses of the Eastern war. The position of the instance of the Emperor's behaviour with regard to Armenia in Dio's narrative has been taken by some as indicative of its priority in time to the Eastern war <sup>71</sup>, whereas in actual fact it offers no chronological indications whatsoever, and the date of the incident has to be determined on other grounds.

In 215, Caracalla began a war on Armenia and Parthia, the pretext for it being the Great King Vologases V's refusal to surrender to him Tiridates and a certain philosopher, both of whom had fled to Iran <sup>72</sup>. Who this Tiridates was, our source — Dio — does not specify, but it is not impossible to identify him. That he was a royal personage, seems difficult to doubt, since his flight was used as a pretext for war on the part of Rome. He fled from Roman territory, where the philosopher had resided already under Septimius Severus and had attached himself to Tiridates, and whence both fled to Iran <sup>73</sup>. Tiridates, being a name unknown among the last Iranian Arsacids, but much in honour among their Armenian cousins, it can be safely assumed that he was an Armenian prince, hostage in the Empire. Roman friendship accepted by, or imposed upon, Chosroes I at the time of Septimius Severus, and Roman subsidies given to him, must quite obviously have entailed the surrender of a hostage or hostages. It can be likewise assumed that a hostage would, in the circumstances, have been the King's son. Even the Great Kings had, on occasion, to give their own sons as hostages to Rome <sup>74</sup>. This Tiridates, son of Chosroes, is the earlier personage of that name, whom the Armenian historical tradition fused with the later Tiridates the Great (3), and whom we shall see follow Chosroes I on the Armenian throne.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, 19, 21.

<sup>71</sup> Cf., e.g., DEBEVOISE, *Parthia*, pp. 262-263. Recently, however, this event (as well as the imprisonment of the King of Osroene) has been dated, correctly, as about May 216 : MILLER, *CAH XII*, 49.

<sup>72</sup> For this war : DIO, 78 (77).19; HERODIAN, 4.10-11; SPARTIANUS, *Caracalla*, 6.1-2; cf. MILLER, *CAH XII*, 49-50; DEBEVOISE, *Parthia*, pp. 264-266. — Earlier, during his winter in Nicomedia (214-215), Caracalla had constructed war engines for the pending Armenian and Parthian war : DIO, *lib. cit.*, 18.1.

<sup>73</sup> DIO, 78 (77).19.1-2.

<sup>74</sup> Thus, in 10 B.C., Phraates IV sent his four sons to Rome. — Tiridates has mistakenly been taken for a brother of Vologases IV or V : JUSTI, *Namenbuch*, p. 345 (4).

Nor ought it to be difficult to reconstruct the events leading to Caracalla's advent to the East. In the years of peace following the war of 197-200, a *rapprochement*, quite natural in the circumstances, may well have been developing between Chosroes I and his Iranian brothers; yet it could hardly have been effected while Tiridates remained a hostage in the Empire. Hence the flight to the safety of Iran. Hence, too, the war which has been called by a source *bellum Armeniacum Parthicumque* <sup>75</sup>. After the opening of the campaign, Caracalla arrived at Antioch in early 215 <sup>76</sup>. This show of force persuaded Vologases to surrender Tiridates, and the philosopher along with him, to the Emperor, who thereupon disbanded the expedition against Iran. However, Armenia had to be punished, and an expedition under the command of Theocritus was despatched there, but was beaten off <sup>77</sup>. A peace of sorts must have followed then (215); and the Emperor journeyed to Alexandria <sup>78</sup>. Thereafter, preparations for war began anew. The plans, as the subsequent events showed, called for an attack on Media Atropatene; for that, it was desirable to return to the policy of Septimius Severus with a view to securing the collaboration or neutrality of Media's neighbour, Armenia.

It was then, in 216, after spending the winter of 215-216 again at Antioch, that Caracalla, using as pretext the quarrels in the Armenian royal family, invited Chosroes for a visit and, treacherously imprisoning him, attempted to set up Roman control in Armenia, exactly as he had done in Osrhoene <sup>79</sup>. This event can only have taken place after the peace of 215, since previous to that, the Empire had, from the moment of Caracalla's arrival in the East, been in the state of war with both Armenia and Iran. Other evidence will confirm the year 216 as the date of this affair (7). But the fruit of trickery was not easily gathered, for the Armenians, instead of submitting, had recourse to arms <sup>80</sup>. A compromise must, nevertheless, have been reached, for the Romans proceeded to invade Media Atropatene <sup>81</sup>, an enter-

<sup>75</sup> SPARTIANUS, *Caracalla*, 6.1.

<sup>76</sup> DIO, 78(77).20.1.

<sup>77</sup> DIO, *lib. cit.*, 21.

<sup>78</sup> SPARTIANUS, *Caracalla*, 6.2; cf. DIO, *lib. cit.*, 22.1.

<sup>79</sup> DIO, *lib. cit.*, 12.1-2.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>81</sup> DIO, 79(78).1; SPARTIANUS, *Caracalla*, 6.4-5 (\*Dehinc per Cadusios et Babylonios ingressus\*). The Cadusians were one of the tribes of Media: POLYBIUS, 5.44.9; STRABO,



prise which — to repeat — required Armenian help or, at least, non-interference. Ps. Moses seems to have preserved a memory of this compromise when he relates that, in Caracalla's war against Iran, Armenia took no sides <sup>82</sup>. Only, of course, he speaks of King Chosroes, being unaware of his imprisonment or unwilling to admit it. This is one of the few sober threads of evidence in the fantastic tapestry of Ps. Moses, one of the very few instances when a Roman Emperor's name is not introduced into his narrative anachronistically. And it confirms the supposition made earlier to the effect that it was with Chosroes I that Caracalla had to deal. Iran meantime had rallied, and it was the Emperor's turn to become frightened; and the war seems to have come to a stand <sup>83</sup>. The winter of 216-217 he spent at Edessa and then, while preparing for still another campaign against Iran, was murdered in April 217 <sup>84</sup>. The fate of Chosroes is unknown; as will be seen, he does not appear to have survived his imprisonment.

7. The Emperor Macrinus succeeding Caracalla faced another conflict with Iran. Whether it was he who began it <sup>85</sup>, or it was the Great King Artabanus V, by invading Roman Mesopotamia <sup>86</sup>, Macrinus soon found himself obliged to sue for peace, sending back captives and placing the blame for all the trouble on his predecessor <sup>87</sup>. His peace offers were rejected, however, and the Iranians continued to advance, until in a battle near Nisibis the Romans met with a defeat <sup>88</sup>. Finally, at an enormous cost, Macrinus bought peace <sup>89</sup>. During this war Armenia appears to have passed actively to the side of the Great King, for the peace of 217 brought about also the end

11.7.1; PLINY, 6. 18. 48. — Until 216, Caracalla's adversary was the Great King Vologases V, but thereafter he had to contend with Artabanus V, who had revolted against his brother: DEBEVOISE, *Parthia*, pp. 263-267.

<sup>82</sup> PS. MOSES, 2.75.

<sup>83</sup> DIO, 79(78).2.

<sup>84</sup> DIO, *lib. cit.*, 4-5; HERODIAN, 4.12-13; SPARTIANUS, *Caracalla*, 6.6-7; 7.1; cf. MILLER, *CAH XII*, 50.

<sup>85</sup> CAPITOLINUS, *Macrinus*, 2.2; 8.1.

<sup>86</sup> DIO, 79(78).26.2.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, cf. CAPITOLINUS, *Macrinus*, 8.3-4.

<sup>88</sup> DIO, *lib. cit.*, 26.3-7; HERODIAN, 4.15; *Arbela Chronicle*, transl. A. MINGANA, *Sources syriaques. I* (Leipzig, 1907), 104.

<sup>89</sup> DIO, *lib. cit.*, 26.8 - 27.1-3; CAPITOLINUS, *Macrinus*, *Macrinus*, 8.3-4.

of hostilities against Armenia <sup>90</sup>. Macrinus had to recognize Tiridates as vassal-King of Armenia and to return to him his mother, whom Caracalla had imprisoned eleven months previously, as well as whatever booty had been taken in Armenia. Tiridates, moreover, entertained the hope of receiving his father's lands in Cappadocia and the annual subsidy which had been granted by Rome <sup>91</sup>. Not long thereafter, Macrinus was threatened by a revolt at home and in June 218 he was slain <sup>92</sup>.

We have already met Tiridates II of Armenia and seen his flight to Iran and his being surrendered back to Rome. Since any supposition that Caracalla had effected several separate arrests of members of the Armenian royal family would be as unwarrantable as devoid of evidence, the mother of Tiridates was, quite obviously, imprisoned together with Chosroes I in 216 (eleven months before 217), and this is the date suggested earlier (6). Chosroes I alone, moreover, could have been the recipient of Roman subsidies in connexion with the war of 197-200; and this further confirms what has been suggested about the parentage of Tiridates II. Although the arrest of Chosroes I seems to have involved also his sons <sup>93</sup>, Tiridates must have been either unaffected by it, or freed, along with other captives, by Macrinus upon the death of Caracalla; and now received his mother liberated from that captivity. No mention is made in this connexion of Tiridates II's father, which must show that Chosroes I died in captivity (between 216 and 217). Tiridates, accordingly, must have succeeded his father before the peace of 217, for Dio, just before speaking of that peace, mentions the war against « the Armenian [king] » <sup>94</sup>. His reign should

<sup>90</sup> Dio, *lib. cit.*, 27.4.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>92</sup> Dio, *lib. cit.*, 39; HERODIAN, 5.4; CAPITOLINUS, *Macrinus*, 8.1; 10; 15.1. — For Mavrinus in the East, see MILLER, *CAH* XII, 50-52; DEBEVOISE, *Parthia*, pp. 266-267.

<sup>93</sup> Dio, 78(77).12.1-2, says that Caracalla invited the King of Armenia who was quarelling with his sons, but that, instead of making peace between them, he treated them as he had King Abgarus of Osrhoene (ἔδρασε δὲ καὶ περὶ τούτους ἃ καὶ περὶ τὸν Ἀβγαρον).

<sup>94</sup> And immediately thereafter mentions him by name : Καὶ μέντοι καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἀρμένιον πολεμωθέντα, ὥσπερ εἶπον, κατέστη, τοῦ Τιριδάτου πεμφθὲν αὐτῷ τὸ διάδημα παρὰ τοῦ Μακρίνου λαβόντος... : Dio, 79(78).27.4. Cf. *supra*, n. 64 for the use of an ethnic adjective alone to designate the king of the corresponding nation.

thus be counted from the probable death of Chosroes (216/7) and not from the moment of the Roman recognition of the *fait accompli* (217).

8. It was within a decade after the accession of Tiridates II that the event, which was destined to leave a most profound impression on the historical memory of the East Mediterranean world, took place, — the overthrow of the Parthian Arsacids by the Persian Sassanids and the consequent «neo-Achaemenian» renewal of Iran. In the strife accompanying this revolution the two rival Great Kings, Vologases V and Artabanus V, met with a violent death; and from 224, the reign of the first Sassanid Great King, Artasir, son of Papak of Staxr, is generally computed<sup>95</sup>. This event set at enmity the usurping Sassanids and the Arsacid dynasties of Armenia, Iberia, and Albania; and of this enmity the epic of the war of revenge waged against Artasir, with Iberian and Albanian aid, by the composite figure of «King Chosroes» — a *geste* which fuses together the events of the reigns of Chosroes I and Chosroes II, as well as of that (as will be seen presently) of Tiridates II — is a hyperbolic memory preserved by the Armenian historical tradition<sup>96</sup>.

One of the first acts of the new Great King was to attack both Rome and Armenia: in the eyes of New Iran, Rome was no greater foe than the scions of the philhellenic Arsacids. The neo-Achaemenian ideology of the Sassanids demanded, moreover, the restoration of the Iranian empire as it had been before Alexander the Great<sup>97</sup>. Accord-

<sup>95</sup> Or from 227, cf. A. CHRISTENSEN, «Sassanid Persia», CAH XII, 109 and n. 4; *L'Iran sous les Sassanides* (Copenhagen, 1944), p. 88 and n. 1.

<sup>96</sup> In the AGATHANGELUS and in Ps. MOSES, 2.67-75. It is impossible to say whether the reference to the Iberian and Albanian aids, and to the opening of the Alan Gates to the hyperborean barbarians (ARM. AGATH., 1.19; GK AGATH., 10) is actually true or is part of the hyperbole; and, if true, then in which of the several wars, the memories of of which have been fused to produce the *geste*. The attempts at a Kushan alliance (ARM. AGATH., 1.20; Ps. MOSES, 2.72) strike one as no less hyperbolic than the claim that Artasir, fleeing before Chosroes, was pursued to the confines of India (Ps. MOSES, 2.74). The references to this *geste* in the Georgian work of LEONTIUS OF RUISI, *Hist. Iber.* (notably, pp. 59, 60-62), are patent borrowings from the Agathangelus (ARM. AGATH., 1, 2, 3.35-36; GK AGATH., 9-16). — The Iberian participation in these events becomes more probable, however, when it is realized that the Kings of Iberia of the time stemmed from a younger brother of Chosroes I of Armenia and so, of Artabanus V: *infra* 15.

<sup>97</sup> DIO, 80.3.4, and HERODIAN, 6.2.4, sum up well these ideological claims.

ingly, in 230, Artasir penetrated into Roman Mesopotamia and laid siege to Nisibis, threatening Syria and raiding Cappadocia. Then he turned to Media subduing it to his control and, from there, struck at Armenia. But the Armenians, with the aid of some unsubdued Medes offered resistance; and the sons of Artabanus V — cousins of Tiridates II — also took part in this war. In the end Artasir was beaten off <sup>98</sup>. To this double provocation — attack on Roman territory and on a Roman vassal — the Emperor Severus Alexander reacted immediately. Attempts at a peaceful settlement having failed, the Emperor, in the spring of 231, set out for the East. The winter of 231-232 was spent at Antioch, and in the spring the war began. The Roman armies were divided into three parts, one of the divisions moving through friendly Armenia into Media. As in the war of 197-200, Rome and Armenia formed a coalition against Iran. However, the lack of success experienced by the other divisions (in northern Mesopotamia and on the Euphrates), and the difficulties of the Armenian winter (232-233) brought the war to a close, with the *status quo* re-established <sup>99</sup>. The memory of this resistance to Artasir on the part of Tiridates II, which was followed by a joint Romano-Armenian attack on Media, and the memories of the Armenian participation in the war of Septimius Severus and in that of Carus are the threads that are woven into the fabric of the *geste* of « King Chosroes » (3). Another onomastic confusion, one between Severus Alexander and Septimus Severus, each allied with Armenia in a war on Iran, must doubtless have prompted the adding of Tiridates II's *res gestae* to that fabric <sup>100</sup>.

Less than a decade later, in the reign of Maximin the Thracian, Artasir, at the end of his life now, struck again, invading north Mesopotamia <sup>101</sup>. Gordian III, succeeding to the purple, took up the challen-

<sup>98</sup> DIO, *lib. cit.*, 3.1-3; ZONARAS, 12.15.

<sup>99</sup> For this war : HERODIAN, 6.2-6; LAMPRIIDIUS, *Alexander*, 50, 55, cf. 56.1-9; AURELIUS VICTOR, *Caesares*, 24; EUTROPIUS, 8.23; ZONARAS, 12.15; cf. W. EISEL, « The Senate and the Army », *CAH* XII, 69-71.

<sup>100</sup> Armenia's alliance with Rome is suggested by Herodian, 6.5 and also 7.2 (where the presence of the Armenian bowmen in Maximin the Thracian's army is mentioned). — The victories of Junius Palmatus (LAMPRIIDIUS, *Alexander*, 58.1) must refer to this joint campaign of 232-233; and a memory of it may lie, disguised, at the base of Ps. Moses's story (2.72) about the Emperor Philip the Arab's aid to Chosroes in his war on Artasir.

<sup>101</sup> CAPITOLINUS, *Max. et Balb.*, 13.5; ZONARAS, 12.8.

ge and declared war in 242. But it was with Artašir's son and successor Sapor I that he had to contend. This war began successfully <sup>102</sup>, but ended in disaster. Sapor's great inscription of the Kaabah of Zoroaster reveals the story. In the battle at Mešik, near Ctesiphon, in February 244, the Roman army, which had penetrated Iranian territory, met with a crushing defeat and the Emperor lost his life. Philip the Arab, then proclaimed Emperor by the soldiers, was constrained to conclude peace as dictated by the victor <sup>103</sup>. The suzerain rights over Armenia were ceded to the Great King and a tribute was promised <sup>104</sup>. Tiridates II was thus obliged to exchange one suzerain for another and less friendly one. The defeat of Rome placed Arsacid Armenia in peril; but nothing, except the transfer of suzerainty, followed the disaster. The kingdom was not invaded, nor does the vassal Arsacid appear to have been in any way importuned by his Sassanid overlord. Occupied elsewhere <sup>105</sup>, Sapor appears to have

<sup>102</sup> For this war : CAPITOLINUS, *Gordiani*, 23.6; 26.2-6; 27.1-3, 5-6; AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS, 23.5.17; ZOSIMUS, 1.18; ZONARAS, 12.18; cf. ENSSLIN, CAH XII, 86-87.

<sup>103</sup> SPRENGLING, *Third Cent. Iran*, p. 7 = Pl. 1, lines 3-4 (Pahlavi); 73 = Pl. 10, lines 6-10 (Greek); 15, III. 1, 2 (translation); pp. 4, 79-85 (interpretation). Sapor's account of the event makes it clear that Gordian III was killed in battle and not slain in the camp, at the instigation of Philip, as the Roman gossip had it, for which, see CAPITOLINUS, *Gordiani*, 28.1; 29.1; 31; ZOSIMUS, 1.19; ZONARAS, 12.18.

<sup>104</sup> When touching upon the cause for the war of 453-460, Sapor's inscription shows that the Roman government had failed to live up to the stipulations of the Treaty of 244 by interfering in Armenia (*infra*, n. 106). This is a proof that, in that treaty the suzerain rights over that country had been ceded to Iran. ZOSIMUS, 3.32, qualifies the Treaty of 244 as shameful (.....) even though nothing that had been in Rome's possession was lost; which is true, since Armenia was a vassal State and not a province. ZONARAS, 12.19, asserts that Philip ceded Mesopotamia and Armenia, but then broke the peace and recovered them. As SPRENGLING, *Third Cent. Iran*, pp. 4, 79-85, has shown, there was never question of Mesopotamia, this assertion of Zonaras being a reverberation of the gossip aimed at Philip. But the statement about the breach of the peace appears true with regard to Armenia : *infra*, nn. 106, 107. The statement of EVAGRIUS, 5.7, that while Great Armenia was ceded to Iran, Lesser Armenia was retained by Rome deserves little attention : it seems, rather obviously, to be a memory of the subsequent partitions of Armenia between Rome and Iran projected to an earlier Romano-Iranian settlement. For this peace, see also ENSSLIN, CAH XII, 88.

<sup>105</sup> *Arbela Chron.*, p. 110, has Sapor, in the first year of his reign, wage war on the Chorasmiens, then the Medes, and finally various peoples in the Caspian regions of Iran. Since Sapor inherited on accession the Roman war begun by his father, these other campaigns (which must have taken several years), even if indeed begun in Sapor's first year (241/2), must have continued even after 244.

been content with the recognition of his overlordship in Armenia.

However, the Emperor Philip himself, or Decius his successor, must have subsequently attempted to re-establish Roman influence in Armenia. This, at least, is implied in Sapor's inscription <sup>106</sup>. And Tiridates II, not unnaturally, must in some way have co-operated with this <sup>107</sup>. The defeat and death of Decius in 251 providing Sapor with what no doubt seemed a propitious moment, he reacted to what he considered a Roman violation of the Treaty of 244 by invading Armenia in 252. Tiridates II fled — quite obviously, to the Empire — while his own sons went over to the enemy <sup>108</sup>. Quite rightly has Tiridates II, who now ends his historical role, been remembered by the Armenian historical tradition as a king who spent his whole reign fighting Iran <sup>109</sup>.

9. The inscription of Sapor I shows that his son Hormisdas-Artašir, chosen to succeed him <sup>110</sup>, was in his father's lifetime King of Armenia <sup>111</sup>. As will be seen (10, 11), another son of Sapor, Narses, before succeeding as Great King in 293, also was one. Armenia, wrested from the Arsacids, was thus made the fief of the Sassanid « Dauphin » <sup>112</sup>.

<sup>106</sup> *Supra*, n. 103 (« Then Caesar, secondly, lied and did wrong to Armenia ») and SPRENGLING, *Third Cent. Iran*, pp. 4, 84, 85, 87 : « lied » means « acted unjustly », in other words, failed to observe the stipulations of 244. That it was giving asylum to Tiridates II, as Sprengling surmises (pp. 4, 85), cannot be accepted, because Tiridates, as will be seen, fled as a result of the invasion of 252, which event had therefore been provoked by something else. And that something else must have been Rome's infringement on Iran's newly acquired suzerain rights over Armenia through an attempt to re-establish some measure of influence there, as well, doubtless, as Tiridates II's response to it; cf. the following note.

<sup>107</sup> The presence of Armenian auxiliaries (600 bowmen) in the Roman army, under Valerian (VOPISCUS, *Aurelianus*, 11.3), who must have been sent to the Empire before the beginning of the war of 253-260, may be an indication of Tiridates II's continued relations with Rome after 244.

<sup>108</sup> ZONARAS, 12.21 : this took place in the reign of the Emperor Gallus. For the date of this event, see SPRENGLING, *Third Cent. Iran*, p. 88 (but cf. p. 26).

<sup>109</sup> ARM. AGATHANGELUS, 12.132; GK AGATHANGELUS, 57. Cf. *supra*, at n. 33.

<sup>110</sup> SPRENGLING, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

<sup>111</sup> SPRENGLING, *op. cit.*, p. 8, line 18 = Pl. 4 and p. 9, line 20 = Pl. 5 (Pahlavi) : p. 11, lines 23, 25 = Pl. 8 (Middle Persian) ; p. 75, lines 41, 48 = Pl. 11, 12 (Greek) ; pp. 17-18, IV, 2, 5 (translation). — I regret not having had access to « Ormizd-Ardechir grand roi d'Arménie » by H. Borbérian, which appeared in *Zwarttrotz*, Cf. Paris, 1944, p. 167-173 (in Armenian).

<sup>112</sup> As Grousset puts it (*Histoire*, p. 179) in connexion with a similar situation in the fifth century.

What the Armenian historical tradition remembers of this period can be seen in a few disjointed threads of memory in the narrative of Ps. Moses <sup>113</sup>. For want of any evidence to the contrary, it may be assumed that Hormisdas-Artašir was invested with the crown-princely fief of Armenia immediately upon the Sassanid acquisition of that country. The Sassanids may be expected to have lost little time in mounting the most important remaining Arsacid throne <sup>114</sup>.

The invasion of Armenia was followed, in the spring of 253, by an attack on Roman territory; and a lightning campaign followed involving Mesopotamia, Syria, Cilicia, and Cappadocia and the capture of cities like Nisibis and Antioch. In it, Sapor I appears to have been assisted by Hormisdas-Artašir <sup>115</sup>. In the autumn of that year, Valerian, newly risen to the purple, began a counter-offensive. The war then dragged on and ended in 260 in the defeat of the Romans and in the capture of the Emperor Valerian <sup>116</sup>. The unheard of had happened. Sapor I's monuments and inscriptions testify to his exultation in this momentous event. The *Historia Augusta*, on its part, may have preserved the evidence of other reactions to it disguised, à la Ps. Moses, in the form of three lettres, obviously fabricated, which are addressed by some lesser monarchs to the victor. The first two letters urge the

<sup>113</sup> Confusing the two kings, Sapor I and Tiridates II, with their respective fathers, Ps. MOSES, 2.76, relates the invasion of Armenia by Artašir after the death of Chosroes. In 2.77, apropos of a later event (*infra*, n. 133), he states, with patent exaggeration, that Armenia was governed by Artašir as one of his own lands (յաշխարհացն) through Iranian agents (գործակալօք); yet, in the same chapter, he speaks of Armenia's receiving the first rank (կարգ առաջին), which is a reference to its being the premier kingdom of the Iranian empire in its capacity as the crown-princely fief: *infra*, n. 140. Since it was a vassal kingdom, under its own kings, albeit of the Sassanid house, it obviously was not a mere province administered through agents.

<sup>114</sup> Besides Armenia, Arsacid branches reigned in Iberia, until 284, and in Albania, until the end of the fifth century: TOUMANOFF, « Chronology of the Early Kings of Iberia », *Traditio*, 25 (1969), NN° 21,22; *Studies*, p. 258; *infra* 15.

<sup>115</sup> The identity with Hormisdas-Artašir of Odomastes, who according to POLLIO, *Tyranni trig.*, 2.2, fought on the side of Sapor, has been accepted, e.g., by SPRENGLING, *Third Cent. Iran*, pp. 90, 91, 93, 96.

<sup>116</sup> Sapor I's inscription on the Kaabah of Zoroaster: SPRENGLING, *op. cit.*, pp. 7-8; lines 4-16 = Pl. 4 (Pahlavi); pp. 73-75, lines 10-35 = Pl. 10-11 (Greek); pp. 15-16, III.2-3 (translation); ZOSIMUS, 1.27, 30, 36; ZONARAS, 12.23; cf. POLLIO, *Gallieni*, I. See also SPRENGLING, pp. 5-6, 87-109. — For this war, see also CHRISTENSEN, *CAH XII*, 132-137.

release of Valerian, the third is full of foreboding <sup>117</sup>. This third letter purports to come from *Artavasdes rex Armeniorum*. Though as fabricated as the Thucydidean discourses, these letters, like the others, are merely a literary device for presenting historical realities; thus it would be unwarrantably simplistic to see in this unknown King Artavasdes anything but a — Classical — disguise for Hormisdas-Artašir <sup>118</sup>. The *Historia Augusta* also shows the reaction of Iberia and Albania, as rather pro-Roman and anti-Iranian <sup>119</sup>. This information would of itself be probably of little worth, but it receives and indirect confirmation from unimpeachable sources. The inscription of the High Priest Kartir speaks of the Iranian invasion of Iberia and Albania after 260 <sup>120</sup>, which can be interpreted as having been provoked

<sup>117</sup> POLLIO, *Valeriani*, 1-3. Only these three letters have been preserved, while the greater part of the Life of Valerian, with possibly more letters and with the opening words of the first that has remained (including the name of the sender), is missing.

<sup>118</sup> The ancient Armenian royal name of Artavasdes had for a Roman, as yet unused to the Sassanian style, a decidedly more familiar — more authentic — ring than the militantly neo-Achaemenian, and therefore essentially anti-Hellenistic, Ohrmizd-Artaxšatr (the first part of which I have *post factum* Hellenized here). If the Odomastes of the *Tyranni Trig.* (*supra*, n. 115) can be held to stand for the first part of the King of Armenia's name, there is no reason why the half-homophonous Artavasdes might not be used to represent, for reasons indicated, that name's second part. This King of Armenia, moreover, is represented as a close collaborator of Sapor in the war of 253-260 (precisely what Odomastes appears to have been): he is said to be sharing in Sapor's glory (« in partem gloriae venio »: 3.1) and to have sent aid to him (« auxilia missimus ») being his neighbour (« vicini sumus »: 3.3). Some scholars, however, have believed in the existence of an Artavasdes V of Armenia. The sender of the second letter, *Valenus* (in some MSS *Balerus*: JUSTI, *Namenbuch*, p. 361) *rex Cadusiorum* may well be a disguise for Bahrām, future Great King Bahrām I, then King of Gilan; he also is represented as having aided in Sapor's war (« remissa mihi auxilia integra et inecolumbia gratanter accipi »: 2.1).

<sup>119</sup> The Iberians and Albanians (as well as, quite improbably, the Bactrians [= Kushans] and the Tauroscythians) are shown as refusing to receive Sapor's announcement of victory and as, in contact with Rome, promising aid for the release of Valerian: *Tyranni Trig.*, 4.

<sup>120</sup> SPRENGLING, *Third Cent. Iran*, p. 47, lines 12-13 = Pl. 16, 17; pp. 51-52 (translation). It refers to the war which the Great King's men carried into Syria, Cilicia, Cappadocia, Armenia, Iberia, Albania, and other Caucasian and Caspian lands and to the implanting of Zoroastrianism in these countries, which followed. The order in which these names are given appears to be geographical rather than chronological. Armenia, of course, was invaded in 252; Syria, Cilicia, and Cappadocia, during the war of 253-260. Accordingly, Iberia and Albania were invaded after 260, probably as a result of their pro-Roman orientation.



by the above reaction of the two kingdoms; and the inscription of Sapor I places Iberia and Albania among his vassals and reveals the existence of an anti-king installed by him in Iberia <sup>121</sup>.

In taking his neo-Achaemenian claims *au pied de la lettre* Sapor overestimated his own possibilities; he could overrun, but not hold, Roman provinces. And as Iran recoiled, and the Empire entered the period of the Thirty Tyrants, a void was created between them, especially in Mesopotamia and Syria, which was then filled by Odaenathus's Palmyrene kingdom. Whatever frictions there were between Odaenathus and Sapor c. 263/5 — and they appear to have been, if not magnified, at least multiplied by Roman historians — Palmyra and Iran soon drew together <sup>122</sup>; and Odaenathus's widow Zenobia was, in the early 270s, an ally of Iran <sup>123</sup>, as well as of Armenia <sup>124</sup> and of Iberia <sup>125</sup>.

10. The Great King Sapor I died late in 271 and was succeeded by Hormisdas-Artašir, who did not live much longer than one year; the succession, then, bypassed Sapor's next favourite son Narses and devolved upon Sapor's (apparently) eldest but less esteemed son Bahrām I and remained until 293 with the latter's homonymous son and grandson <sup>126</sup>. Since Narses, as we shall see presently (also 11), was King of Armenia before ascending as Great King in 293, it seems

<sup>121</sup> SPRENGLING, *op. cit.*, p. 7, line 2 = Pl. 1 (Pahlavi); p. 73, line 2 = Pl. 10 (Greek); p. 14, II (translation). The King of Iberia set up by Sapor was Amazaspus (Xamazasp): *ibid.*, p. 9, line 25 = Pl. 6 (Pahlavi); p. 12, lines 30-31 = Pl. 8-9 (Middle Persian); p. 76, line 60 = Pl. 12 (Greek); p. 19, IV. 6c (translation); cf. my *Chron. of the Early Kings of Iberia*, NN° 20; 20a.

<sup>122</sup> POLLIO, *Valeriani*, 4.2-4; *Gallieni*, 10; 12.1; 13.1-5; *Tyranni Trig.*, 15; ZOSIMUS, 1.39; ZONARAS, 12.23-24; cf. SPRENGLING, *Third Cent. Iran*, pp. 108-109.

<sup>123</sup> VOPISCUS, *Aurelianus*, 27.4; 28.2; ZOSIMUS, 1.55; cf. SPRENGLING, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

<sup>124</sup> *Aurelianus*, 27.5; POLLIO, *Tyranni Trig.*, 30.7, 18-19.

<sup>125</sup> *Aurelianus*, 33.4.

<sup>126</sup> SPRENGLING, *Third Cent. Iran*, pp. 109-110. In his Kaabah of Zoroaster inscription, Sapor I, instituting royal fires for his sons Hormisdas-Artašir, Sapor, and Narses, omits Bahrām: *ibid.*, p. 8, lines 18-19 = Pl. 4 (Pahlavi); p. 75, lines 41-42 = Pl. 11 (Greek); p. 18, IV. 2 (translation); and when instituting sacrifices for the members of his family, though indeed he mentions Bahrām, he omits the latter's children among his own grandchildren: pp. 8-9, lines 20-22 = Pl. 5 (Pahlavi); p. 75, lines 46-51 = Pl. 11-12 (Greek); p. 17-18, IV. 5 (translation).

not unreasonable to suppose that Hormisdas-Artašir, on becoming Great King, set up his brother on the throne he had just vacated<sup>127</sup>.

Meantime, the energetic Aurelian became Emperor in 270 and turned his attention to the East, focussing it chiefly on the spectacular and prepotent Zenobia of Palmyra. In the years 271-272, he destroyed Palmyra's ephemeral might, brought Mesopotamia under Roman control, and also inflicted defeat on Zenobia's Iranian, Armenian, and Iberian allies<sup>128</sup>. That a result of this successful war was a momentary re-establishment of Roman authority in Caucasia, seems borne out by the statement of the *Historia Augusta* to the effect that the divinity of the Emperor Aurelian was recognized in Iberia, Albania, and Armenia<sup>129</sup>. In view of this, even if Narses had become King of Armenia in 271, he can hardly be expected to have continued as a Roman vassal. However, in 275, having returned to the West, Aurelian again declared war on Iran, but was killed before it could begin<sup>130</sup>. One may surmise that the cause of this intended war was the reversion of Armenia and Mesopotamia<sup>131</sup> to Iranian control; if true, this would mean that Narses may have regained — or indeed come to reign in — Armenia soon after Aurelian's departure from the East in 273.

At all events, Narses was King of Armenia in 279/80. The *Historia Augusta* records the offers of peace made to the Emperor Probus, then in the East, coming from « Narseus », whom it represents as a Great King; and while one passage creates the impression that these offers were rejected, the opening words of the next affirm that peace

<sup>127</sup> While Sapor was Great King and Hormisdas-Artašir King of Armenia, Narses was King of India, Sakistān, and Tūristān : *ibid.* (the second mention has him as only King of Sakistān). Elias bar Šināyā qualifies Narses (Narsi) as Garmānšāh : ed. E. Brooks, *Eliæ metropolitæ Nisibeni opus chronologicum (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, series III, vol. VII [Paris, 1910], p. 42; Latin tr. Brooks ibid., 23 (Louvain, 1954), p. 26. It seems likely that Garmānšāh, which means nothing, is an error for Armānšāh.*

<sup>128</sup> VOPISCUS, *Aurelianus*, 28.1-2, 4; 29.4-5; 30.4; 33.4 (Iberians in Aurelian's triumph); 35.4-5; ZOSIMUS, 1.39, 44, 45, 50-60; ZONARAS, 12.27.

<sup>129</sup> *Aurelianus*, 41.10.

<sup>130</sup> *Ibid.*, 35.4-5.

<sup>131</sup> By the beginning of the reign of Probus (276) Mesopotamia seems to have been no longer under Roman control : ZOSIMUS, 1.64.

was in fact made <sup>132</sup>. Since Narses was not to ascend the throne of Iran until 293, he must have concluded this peace with Pacorus in his capacity as King of Armenia and been remembered by the author of the *Life of Probus*, or his source, in his *subsequent* capacity as Great King, — a perfectly natural confusion. That this was so, seems confirmed by a thread of evidence in the fantastic tapestry of Ps. Moses's narrative, one concerning the peace concluded by the Emperor Probus and the Great King Artasir, who partitioned Armenia between them, marking the boundary line with a series of ditches <sup>133</sup>. « Artasir » and « Chosroes », Sassanid royal names par excellence, became symbols for the Great King (and even a Sassanid King of Armenia) in much East Mediterranean historical writing, in the same way as « Caesar » stood for the Roman Emperor <sup>134</sup>. But Ps. Moses, a slave to his *esprit de système* (one quite mistaken unfortunately), felt obliged to make clear that the « Artasir » in this case was indeed the first Sassanid monarch and father of Sapor I <sup>135</sup>. It is not perhaps too difficult to surmise as to what had prompted Narses to enter into negotiations with Probus. Bent on superseding on the Iranian throne the family of Bahrām I <sup>136</sup>, Narses must have wished to ensure his rear from a Roman attack. Probus, on his part, intending to attack Iran — he was actually preparing for an Iranian war, continuing in this the policy of Aurelian, when he was murdered in 281 <sup>137</sup> — needed, as ever, Armenia's non-interference so as to ensure the security of his left flank. The price that Narses paid was cession to Rome of Armenia's western moiety and his neutrality in a war that was waged against his rival on the throne of Iran. Rome, in exchange, must have had

<sup>132</sup> VOPISCUS, *Probus*, 17.4-6; 18.1 (« facta igitur pax cum Persis »). — For the date 279/80, cf. H. MATTINGLY, « The Imperial Recovery », *CAH* XII, 316. Taking *au pied de la lettre* the attribution to Narses of his *later* position as Great King, as found in *Probus*, Mattingly substitutes (*loc. cit.*) for Narses the name of the Great King of the moment, i.e., Bahrām (Vahram) II.

<sup>133</sup> Ps. MOSES, 2.77; cf. UXTANĒS, 1.76.

<sup>134</sup> *Infra*, Appendix B; cf. the use of Xuasro/K'asre in Georgian historical literature to designate any Great King: *Studies*, p. 366 n. 35; For the similar Persian and Arabic usage, see JUSTI, *Namenbuch*, p. 138; cf. also the Byzantine use of *Xoapóns* for the Abbasid Caliph, CEDREUS (Bonn, 1838), II, 433; PSELLUS, *Chronographia*, I.10, II.

<sup>135</sup> *Supra*, n. 37.

<sup>136</sup> SPRENGLING, *Third Cent. Iran*, p. 110; HENNING, *Farewell to... Aq-Aqalārān*, p. 517.

<sup>137</sup> *Probus*, 20.1; VOPISCUS, *Carus*, 8.1.

to recognize Narses as King in his part of Armenia <sup>138</sup>. What we have before us is the first, and hitherto unnoticed, partition of Armenia between the rival empires.

Another thread of evidence in Ps. Moses refers to the restoration of the Arsacids in their possessions, as consequent upon the Peace of Probus <sup>139</sup>. This can only be a memory of the restoration, in the Roman part of Armenia and indeed resulting from the partition, of the Arsacid royal family which had been dispossessed in 252 (8). Still another thread of authentic evidence appears in the statement of Ps. Moses to the effect that Armenia was under Iranian rule for 27 years <sup>140</sup>. Adding 27 to 252 we obtain 279/80, which is precisely the date of the Peace of Probus and Narses and of the restoration of the Arsacids in — at least western — Armenia. The restored Arsacid king must, for chronological reasons, be Chosroes II, father of Tiridates the Great and, presumably, son of Tiridates II.

It was during his reign that another Roman war on Iran, involving a thrust towards Ctesiphon, occurred — the war of Carus in 283. And it has contributed, as has been seen (3) to the confusion by the Armenian historical tradition between Chosroes I and Chosroes II. The Emperor Carus took up where Probus has left off. He struck at Iran, then

<sup>138</sup> I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness for the conjecture about the Peace of Probus and «Narseus» to B.C. MacDermot's yet unpublished study *Armenia and the Euphrates Frontier*, which the author has very kindly allowed me to read, but with the main thesis of which I find it impossible to agree.

<sup>139</sup> Ps. Moses, 2.77; cf. the following note.

<sup>140</sup> *Ibid.* This chapter is a typical example of the complex fabric of the narrative of Ps. Moses, from which separate threads or themes can be unravelled. It thus contains the following threads or themes (among others): 1) Probus and Artasir make peace and divide Armenia, the boundary line being marked with ditches (a detail that has an authentic ring); 2) Armenia is given the first rank; 3) the Arsacids are re-established in their possessions; 4) Armenia is administered as one of the Iranian lands; 5) Armenia is ruled by Iranian officials for 27 years (UXTANES, 1.67, speaks of an interregnum of 27 years). Now theme 1 refers to the partition. Theme 2 obviously refers to the setting up of Hormisdas-Artasir as King of Armenia after 252 (*supra*, n. 113), and so, equally obviously, is taken from another context. Theme 3 refers to the end of the 27 years of «interregnum» and to the restoration of the Arsacids. And themes 4 and 5 refer to the entire period of 252-279/80 when the whole of Armenia was, as the crown-princely fief, an integral part of the Iranian empire. This is a good illustration of the positive and negative sides of Ps. Moses: the authenticity of much that he has preserved and the unacceptability of the whole, as formed by him out of these bits of history.

troubled by the revolt in the East of the Great King Bahrām II's brother Hormisdas <sup>141</sup>, and after overrunning Mesopotamia pushed towards Ctesiphon, only to die near the Iranian capital in late summer of that year <sup>142</sup>. His son Numerian appears to have been then defeated by the Iranians, and the Romans may have evacuated Mesopotamia <sup>143</sup>. It was Diocletian who, sometime between 284 and 289, by an accord with the Great King definitively re-established Roman control in Mesopotamia and, as is often said, in Armenia <sup>144</sup>. But as we know, West Armenia had already been under the Roman aegis after the Peace of Probus and Narses in 279/80, and East Armenia must have remained with Narses. So in the war of Carus, while Narses of East

<sup>141</sup> CHRISTENSEN, *Iran Sass.*, p. 228.

<sup>142</sup> Carus, 8; SYNESIUS, *De regno*, 12; EUTROPIUS, 9.18; VICTOR, 38; ZONARAS, 12.30. — Cf. MATTINGLY, *CAH XII*, 321.

<sup>143</sup> ZONARAS, 12.30 (defeat). That, before Diocletian, the Euphrates was the eastern boundary of the Empire and, therefore, Mesopotamia in Iranian hands, is clear from the following Latin Panegyrics: EUMENIUS [*pro instaur. scolis*], ed. R.A.B. MYNORS (*XII Panegyrici Latini* [Oxford, 1964]), IX (IV). 18.4 (\*Nam quid ego alarum et cohortium castra peroenseam toto Rhēni et Histri et Eufratae limite restituta?); MAMERTINUS (?), *paneg. Maximiano Aug.*, X(II).2.6 (\*Ibo scilicet uirtutis tuae nestigiis colligendis per totum Histri limitem perque omnem qua tendit Eufraten et ripas peragrabō Rhēni et litus Oceani?); *ibid.*, 7.5 (\*Credo, itidem opimam illam fertilemque Syriam uelut amplexu suo tegebat Eufrates, antequam Diocletiano sponte se dederent regna Persarum\*). Cf. ASDOURIAN, *Arm. u. Rom.*, pp. 132-133.

<sup>144</sup> For this accord: MAMERTINUS, *paneg. Maximiano Aug.*, X(II).7.5 (*supra* n. 143); 10.6-7 (\*Hoc eodem modo rex ille Persarum, numquam se ante dignatus hominem confiteri, fratri tuo [Diocletiano] supplicat totumque, si ingredi ille dignetur, regnum suum pandit. Offert interim uaria miracula, eximiae pulchritudinis feras mittit, amicitiae nomen impertrare contentus promeretur obsequio\*); *Genethliacum Maximiani Augusti*, XI(III).5.4 (\*... etiam illa quae armorum uestrorum terrore facta sunt uelut armis gesta praetereo, Francos ad petendam pacem cum rege uenientes Parthumque uobis munusculum miraculis blandientem\*); 6.6 (\*Vobis Rhēnus et Hister et Nilus et cum gemino Tigris Eufrate ...\*); cf. ASDOURIAN, *op. cit.*, pp. 133-135. Because Mesopotamia and Armenia had already been under Roman control, the Peace of 298 (11) does not refer to the cession of either by Iran to Rome; and AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS, 23.5.11, states that Nerses, in 297, occupied *Armeniam Romani iuri obnoxiam*. — The earliest reference to this accord is found in the panegyric addressed to Maximian, and attributed to Mamertinus, of 289/91; but the accord itself has been dated as of 287, because it has been believed to have been connected with the installation of Tiridates IV the Great, which, in turn, was believed, on the basis of Ps. Moses, 2.82, to have taken place in 287 (cf. ASDOURIAN, *loc. cit.*; STEIN, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, I [tr. J.R. Palanque, Paris, 1959], pp. 67, 434 n. 8\*); but this is baseless (12-14).

Armenia remained benevolently neutral, Chosroes II of West Armenia took an active part (3). Then, in 287, according to the Synchronistic Table in Eusebius (Sebēos), Chosroes II was murdered <sup>145</sup>; and his infant son Tiridates was carried off to the Empire <sup>146</sup>. He was to ascend the throne of Armenia eleven years later. As to who occupied that throne during these eleven years, the Armenian historical tradition is silent and, confusing Chosroes II with Chosroes I (3), introduces the mention of the Iranian invasion of 252 <sup>147</sup>.

11. The Paikuli inscription of the Great King Narses is of importance to us on two counts. First, by stating twice that Narses ascended as Great King upon his return to Iran from Armenia <sup>148</sup>, it forms together with what the *Historia Augusta* reports about the peace of Probus and Narseus and what the Armenian historical tradition disguises as the Peace of Probus and Artasir, a reasonably convincing evidence that Narses was indeed King of Armenia. Second, it mentions among the foreign monarchs who offered to Narses their congratulations on his accession as Great King in 293 a « Tirdāt the King » <sup>149</sup> whom it is difficult not to recognize as an Arsacid King of Armenia <sup>150</sup>. Since he cannot be Tiridates the Great, who ascended the throne only in 298 (12-14), he must be another Armenian king of that name. Here Eliseus throws an unexpected light on this obscure moment. A propos of quite different matters, he speaks of Tiridates the Great who « from infancy and in order to escape his father-slaying and murderous uncles » was brought up in the Empire <sup>151</sup>. The unimpeachable witness of Eliseus reveals that, contrary to the version of the Epos of the Iranian War which, in fusing together Chosroes II and Chosroes I, makes this composite person struggle against Artasir and then perish at the hand of the murderer sent by the latter <sup>152</sup>, Chosroes II was

<sup>145</sup> *Infra*, Appendix B, VII.

<sup>146</sup> ARM. AGATHANGELUS, 3.36; GK AGATHANGELUS, 16; PS. MOSES, 2.76.

<sup>147</sup> ARM. AGATHANGELUS, 3.36-37; GK AGATHANGELUS, 16; cf. PS. MOSES, 2.76. The latter places the Peace of Probus and Narses (« Artasir ») after this event : 2.77.

<sup>148</sup> HERZFELD, *Paikuli*, pp. 98-99, lines 9,10; cf. HENNING, *Farewell*, pp. 517-518.

<sup>149</sup> HERZFELD, *Paikuli*, pp. 118-119, line 45.

<sup>150</sup> Cf. *ibidem*, pp. 147-148.

<sup>151</sup> ELISEUS, 3.54 (p. 92).

<sup>152</sup> ARM. AGATHANGELUS, 2-24-34; GK AGATHANGELUS, 13-15; PS. MOSES, 2.74.

in actual fact slain by his brothers, uncles of Tiridates the Great <sup>153</sup>. It was, possibly, also the horror of this fratricide that caused the disguising of the murderers as an Iranian agent, and the reign of one of them as an Iranian conquest, which, according to the Synchronistic Table in Eusebius lasted for eleven years <sup>154</sup>. Accordingly, the one of the murderous brothers of Chosroes II, uncles of Tiridates the Great, who occupied the throne in 287-298, must be the King Tiridates of the Paikuli inscription. It would have been hardly unexpected that a Tiridates (II), son of a Chosroes (I), should have named his eldest son Chosroes (II) and his next son Tiridates, and that the second Chosroes should have named his son, in turn, Tiridates. Another reason why this King, Tiridates III, has been overlooked by the Armenian historical tradition must be that, as will be seen presently, he was, naturally enough, fused with his great namesake, Tiridates IV the Great.

It is possible that, in setting out for the conquest of the Iranian throne from his great-nephew Bahrām III in 293, Narses, for the same reason as had impelled him to seek a peace settlement with Probus, ceded to Tiridates III — most likely in exchange for vassal allegiance — the eastern part of Armenia he had vacated. The Armenian historical tradition bears, uncomprehending, witness to all this. Confusing Tiridates the Great with his uncle Tiridates III, Ps. Moses places the former's accession in the year 287 <sup>155</sup>, while Samuel of Ani reports a version placing his accession in 293 <sup>156</sup>. In actual fact, of course, the first date is that of Tiridates III's accession in West Armenia; the second, that of his accession in East Armenia and of the consequent reunification of the country <sup>157</sup>. This tradition, moreover, assigns

<sup>153</sup> Some 35 years previously, the sons of Tiridates II had passed to the Iranians : ZONARAS, 12.21 ; *supra* 8.

<sup>154</sup> *Infra*, Appendix B, VII. This «Iranian domination» of 11 years' duration is, obviously, a reference to a different period than the «Iranian domination» which lasted 27 years.

<sup>155</sup> MS. MOSES, 2.82 : in the 3rd year of Diocletian ; cf. *infra* 12.

<sup>156</sup> *Infra*, n. 172.

<sup>157</sup> Confusing Tiridates III with his brother Chosroes II, and then confusing both with Tiridates the Great, Uxtanēs, 1.73, makes the latter become king in the reign of Probus. But in 1.80, he, like Ps. Moses, speaks of the 3rd year of Diocletian. All this induced F. Tournèize into the singular error of suggesting two successive installations of Tiridates the Great, by Probus and then by Diocletian : *Histoire politique et religieuse de l'Arménie* (Paris, 1910), pp. 436-438. Cf. *infra*, 12.

48 years of reign to Tiridates the Great's immediate predecessor, and 20 years to the king before him; but, owing to the telescoping already noted (3), it speaks of Chosroes and Vologases<sup>158</sup>. These regnal years can only be explained in the following way. Tiridates the Great's immediate predecessor was Tiridates III, to whose 11 years of reign — in keeping with the apparent inability of the historical tradition to accept more than one Tiridates, or more than one Chosroes — were added the 36 years of the earlier Tiridates II, thus totalling nearly 48 (actually, 47) years. And Tiridates III's predecessor, in East Armenia, was Narses, who in fact reigned for 20 years (c.273-293). The following table will illustrate this :

*Traditional*

- c. Vologases, 20 years
- b. Chosroes, 48 years
- a. Tiridates the Great

*Historical*

- c. Narses, c. 273-293
- b. Tiridates III, 287-293-298  
+ (Tiridates II, 216/7-252)
- a. Tiridates the Great

The similarity of their political orientation may additionally have contributed to the fusion of Tiridates II and Tiridates III in this context. The former, having been a Roman vassal from 217, became a vassal of Iran in 244 (8); the latter, a vassal of Rome in West Armenia from 287, became an Iranian vassal in East Armenia in 293. This is perhaps one reason why his reign has been disguised as an Iranian conquest.

Soon after his accession as Great King, Narses felt strong enough to resume the neo-Achaemenian policy of his father, which had been interrupted by the reign of the three Bahrāms, with their interest in the religious organization of Iran<sup>159</sup>, and by himself, through his concessions to Probus and to Tiridates III. He, therefore, began a war on Rome early in 297, and in the course of it successfully invaded Mesopotamia and Armenia. But, before the year was over, he was mauled in Armenia by Caesar Galerius<sup>160</sup>. This ended the war, and

<sup>158</sup> *Prim. History*, p. 12; Ps. MOSES, 2.65 (Vologases), 2.74 (Chosroes).

<sup>159</sup> SPRENGLING, *Third Cent. Iran*, p. 110.

<sup>160</sup> Manifesting the tendency, so often noted, of the Armenian historical tradition to confuse and fuse into one several homonymous sovereigns, FAUSTUS, 3.21, projects the story of the defeat of Narses by Galerius in 297 to the reign of Tiran-Tiridates V (339-350): ANANIAN, *Data e circ.*, pp. 58-59, 69-72.



peace was concluded in 298 at Nisibis <sup>161</sup>. Among its provisions were the following points : the Syrian and the Arabian March of the Armenian Monarchy, each with its four princely States, and some Mesopotamian territory — the *regiones transtigritanae* — passed under the control of Rome, and the Tigris became the frontier between the two empires <sup>162</sup>; the eastern frontier of Armenia was pushed to the fortress of Zintha in Media Atropatene <sup>163</sup>; and the suzerain rights

<sup>161</sup> For this war and peace; VICTOR, 39.33-37; FESTUS, 25; EUTROPIUS, 9.24-25; AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS, 17.5.6; 23.5.11; 25.7.9; PETER THE PATRICIAN, fr. 14, *Fragmenta historicorum graecorum*, IV, 189); cf. STEIN, *Histoire du Bas Emp.*, I, 79-80 (and, for the chronology of the war and the peace, pp. 448-449); MATTINGLY, CAH XII, 335-337; ASDOURIAN, *Arm. u. Rom.*, pp. 135-138.

<sup>162</sup> The principalities of the Syrian March (former Kingdom of Sophene) were Lesser Sophene, Ingilene, Anzitene, and Greater Sophene (Sophanene); those of the Arabian March were Arzanene (the principedom of the Vitaxa of the entire march, which was also called Arzanene in a broad sense), Moxoene, Corduene, and Zabdicene; the Mesopotamian region was Rehimene: *Studies*, pp. 166-182. Point 1 of the treaty of Nisibis is mentioned by Festus, 25, who earlier, 14, refers to « *quinque gentium trans Tigridem constitutarum dicionem* ». Peter the Patrician, fr. 14, gives the names of indeed five principdoms (τὴν Ἰντιληνὴν [= Ἰγγιληνὴν] μετὰ Σοφηνῆς καὶ Ἀρζανηνὴν μετὰ Καρδουηνῶν καὶ Ζαβδικηνῆς Ῥωμαίους ἔχειν). On the other hand, when speaking of the retrocession of these lands to Iran in 363, Ammianus Marcellinus, 25.7.9, speaks of the following : « *Arzanenam et Moxoenam et Zabdicenam, itidemque Rehimenam et Corduenam cum castellis quindecim* ». This makes it clear that the list of Peter omits from the Arabian March the principality of Moxoene and the Mesopotamian land of Rehimene, because Moxoene was a dependency of Arzanene, and Rehimene that of Zabdicene: ADONTZ, *Armenija*, pp. 42-43. This explains also why that list omits in the Syrian March, Anzitene and Lesser Sophene, the former being a dependency of Ingilene (*Studies*, pp. 170-172) and the two Sophenes being easily confused. This must also be the reason why, already in the fourth century, Festus speaks of only five princely States. Cf. *Studies*, pp. 150, 166 n. 63. Ammianus, 21.6.7, refers to these territories as *regiones transtigritanae*, cf. Festus, 25, although from the Roman point of view it would have been more natural to call them *regiones transeuphratesiae*. By the Treaty of Nisibis, these eight princely States became immediate vassals of the Roman Emperor, while continuing to recognize a tenuous suzerainty of the King of Armenia. This was a case of dual control. In 363, the Arabian March was ceded to Iran, but the Princes of the Syrian March (misnamed « *satraps* ») continued as vassals of the Emperor until dispossessed by Justinian I in 532: *Studies*, pp. 170-175, 180-182.

<sup>163</sup> Peter the Patrician, fr. 14 : Ἀρμενίαν δὲ Ζίνθα τὸ κάστρον ἐν μεθορίῳ τῆς Μηδικῆς κείμενον ὀρίζειν. Fr. Peeters has put up a vigorous fight against the obvious meaning of this phrase, in « *L'intervention politique de Constance II dans la Grande Arménie, en 338* », reprinted in *Recherches d'histoire et de philologie orientales*, I (Brussels, 1951).

over the King of Iberia were ceded by the Great King to the Emperor<sup>164</sup>. Roman rights over Mesopotamia, which Diocletian had acquired in his accord with Bahrām II, were tacitly admitted by Iran, as were also those over Armenia<sup>165</sup>, except that the settlement of the Armeno-Median frontier implied the extension of these rights to the eastern moiety of the kingdom which had hitherto (after the Peace of Probus and Narses) been under Iranian control. Tiridates III, who first reunited Armenia in 293, but under Iranian auspices, must thereby have been compromised in the eyes of the victors; so he vanishes from history, replaced by his Roman-educated nephew Tiridates the Great.

12. The problem of the chronology of the reign of Tiridates IV the Great and of the Conversion of Armenia has been complicated by

However, the fact, adduced by him, that the eastern frontier of the Empire did not change until the reign of Constantius II (pp. 235-236), has no bearing on this point of the Treaty of Nisibis. Nor has the fact that the river 'Ἀσποῦδης ἐν Μηδικῇ, where the Roman plenipotentiary, Sicorius Probus, was taken by the Great King, is actually the river C'xenis-Cqali in Beda, in Colchis (pp. 233-235). The *Μηδικῇ* in this case may well have been written under the influence of the real *Μηδικῇ* of the above citation, which is mentioned later in Peter's text. If Armenia was under Roman control, why should any attempts have been made to fix its western boundary, as Fr Peeters seems to suggest (pp. 236-237)? But there was every reason to stress the fact that now the eastern moiety of the country, which until that moment had been (ever after the Peace of Probus and Narses) under Iranian suzerainty, was by the Peace of Nisibis passing under that of Rome, in other words, that the whole of Armenia, not merely its western moiety as before, was now a Roman vassal State. The fortress of Zintha in Media Atropatene is otherwise unknown. It can hardly be the town of Zanjān which is too far east of any possible frontier between Armenia and Media. Zendān, meaning 'prison', which was the name of quite another locality (CHRISTENSEN, *Iran Sass.*, p. 455), may conceivably have been the name also of a Median frontier fortress, otherwise unimportant, which was rendered as *Ζίνθα*. At all events, this point of the Treaty of Nisibis should be placed in the context of the title of *Medicus maximus*, assumed, together with *Persicus*, *Abiabenicus*, and *Armeniacus*, by the members of the Tetrarchy: ASDOURIAN, *Arm. u. Rom.*, pp. 137-138 n. 5.

<sup>164</sup> Peter the Patrician, fr. 14: τὸν δὲ Ἰβηρίας βασιλέα τῆς οἰκίας βασιλείας τὰ σύμβολα Ῥωμαίοις ὀφείλειν. It is clear from Leontius of Ruisi that Meribanes (Mirian) III, King of Iberia, took part, as an Iranian vassal, in the war of Narses, but that later peace was made between him and the Emperor, as well as between him and King Tiridates of Armenia: *Hist. Iber.*, pp. 69-70. There is in that narrative (p. 67) also a confused reference to a conference held near Nisibis.

<sup>165</sup> AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS, 17.5.6, reports the Great King Sapor II as asserting that Armenia and Mesopotamia were wrested by the Roman Empire from his grandfather, i.e., Narses; cf. *supra*, n. 144.

the excessive credulity of some historians which made them take *au pied de la lettre* the whole tapestry of the Epos of the Iranian War, instead of critically evaluating only its separate details, and all the synchronisms with which Ps. Moses crams, in a haphazard way, his narrative. Recently, however, the scholarship of Hakob Manandian and Fr Ananian has solved the vexing problem. Only a few considerations can, therefore, be added here to the fruit of their investigations.

All the extant sources agree in stating that Tiridates was placed on the throne of Armenia by, or in the reign of, the Emperor Diocletian (284-305), one of them giving, as an alternative version, the report that he became king in the reign of Probus (276-281)<sup>166</sup>. All assert that he was reigning when the Council of Nicaea was held (325)<sup>167</sup>. All aver that it was he and St Gregory the Illuminator who sent the latter's son Aristaces (Aristakēs) to that Council<sup>168</sup>; and in fact 'Αρωσράκης Ἀρμενίας was one of the Fathers of Nicaea<sup>169</sup>. The disagreement between the sources begins in connexion with the date of the accession of Tiridates IV. Accordingly, Ps. Moses dates that event as in the 3rd year of Diocletian (= 287)<sup>170</sup>; Uxtanēs records two versions, one indeed placing it in 3 Diocletian (= 287) and the other in the reign of Probus<sup>171</sup>; Samuel of Ani, too, mentions two different dates for it: 1 Diocletian (= 285) and 9 Diocletian (= 293)<sup>172</sup>; finally, Ps. Moses adduces a synchronism which suggests the year 293<sup>173</sup>. In reality, as has been noted (11), the year 287 (= 3 Diocletian)

<sup>166</sup> Synchronistic Table in EUSEBIUS (*infra*, Appendix B, VIII); PS. MOSES, 2.82; UXTANĒS, 1.72, 80; SAMUEL OF ANI, col. 661-662. UXTANĒS, 1.73, mentions the alternative version of the investiture by Probus as based on Zenobius, although Ps. Zenobius, as we have the work now, does not speak of this; see *infra*, n. 171.

<sup>167</sup> ARM. AGATHANGELUS, 127.884-891; GK AGATHANGELUS, 169; ARABIC LIFE OF ST GREGORY, 186-187; PS. MOSES, 2.89-90; EUSEBIUS, *Histiry*, 33, pp. 206-208; *Narratio*, 1.

<sup>168</sup> ARM. AGATHANGELUS, 127.884, 886; GK AGATHANGELUS, 169; ARABIC LIFE OF ST GREGORY, 186; FAUSTUS, 3.2; PS. MOSES, 2.89-90; EUSEBIUS, 33, pp. 206-208; *Narratio*, 1.

<sup>169</sup> H. GELZER, H. HILGENFELD, and O. CUNITZ, *Patrum Nicaenorum nomina* (Leipzig, 1898), p. 72 n. 37; p. 65 n. 103 ('Αρωσράκης). Cf. GARITTE, *Documents*, pp. 226-227.

<sup>170</sup> PS. MOSES, 2.82.

<sup>171</sup> SAMUEL OF ANI, col. 661-662.

<sup>172</sup> SAMUEL OF ANI, col. 661-662.

<sup>173</sup> PS. MOSES, 2.83: upon accession, Tiridates married Ašxē, and at the same time, at Nicomedia, Diocletian's daughter Maximina married Constantine, son of Constantius I.

is the date of the accession of Tiridates III in West Armenia and the year 293 (= 9 Diocletian) is that of his accession in East Armenia and his unification of the entire kingdom, and both dates have been claimed, through confusion between the homonymous uncle and nephew, for the latter. And then, confusing both kings with Chosroes II, it has been claimed that Tiridates IV — instead of his father — had been set up as king by Probus <sup>174</sup>. The dating of his accession as of 1 Diocletian (= 285) is also susceptible of an explanation. Uxtanēs twice gives the following synchronism : the conversion of Tiridates occurred in his 15th regnal year or *anno mundi* 5800 <sup>175</sup>. Now the latter date, according to the Alexandrian Era, is A.D. 308 <sup>176</sup>, which puts the accession to 293 (293 + 15) — and this is a third version given, unwittingly, by Uxtanēs. On the other hand, according to the era of Julius Africanus, A.M. 5800 = A.D. 300 <sup>177</sup>, which would place, absurdly, the accession of Tiridates at 285. It is, quite obviously, these two possible interpretations of the synchronism given by Uxtanēs, or his source, that Samuel of Ani mentions as 1 Diocletian (= 285) and 9 Diocletian (= 293). Only the Synchronistic Table in Eusebius gives a date that does not apply to any of Tiridates IV's predecessors, but is that of his own accession : 15 Diocletian (= 298) and as 11 years after the murder of his father Chosroes II (287) <sup>178</sup>.

13. Tiridates was brought to the Empire, upon his father's death in 287, as an infant, so he cannot have been much older than seven; his birth-date may, thus, be tentatively suggested as c. 280 <sup>179</sup>. This

Theodora, Maximian's step-daughter, and of Galerius with Valeria, Diocletian's daughter; cf. STEIN, *Hist. du Bas-Empire*, I, 68.

<sup>174</sup> *Supra*, n. 157.

<sup>175</sup> UXTANĒS, I.78, 80.

<sup>176</sup> V. GRUMEL, *La Chronologie (Traité d'études byzantines*, I [Paris, 1958]), pp. 85-97, 219, 240-241.

<sup>177</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 22-24, 30, 219.

<sup>178</sup> *Infra*, Appendix B, VII, VIII; Appendix C.

<sup>179</sup> The plausibility of this date can be tested genealogically. His father Chosroes II must have been old enough, let us say at least 16, to go over to the side of the Iranian invaders in 252, therefore his birth can be put hypothetically at c. 236 and that of his brother Tiridates III at c. 237. Accordingly, Chosroes II may have come to the throne (in 279/80) at the age of about 43/4 and died (in 287) at the age of about 51. Tiridates IV may, thus, have been born when Chosroes II was about 44. Tiridates II may be assumed, quite hypothetically again, to have been at least 4 when given as hostage to the Romans (c. 198) and so to have been born c. 194. When he fled to Iran (c. 214) he may

date may find indirect confirmation in the sources. Ps. Moses makes St Gregory the Illuminator begin his pontificate in 17 Tiridates IV and retire in 46 Tiridates IV, he assigns to the former 30 years of pontificate <sup>180</sup> and to the latter 56 years of reign <sup>181</sup>. As has been admirably explained by Fr Ananian <sup>182</sup> the number 56 is the result of a mistaken calculation. To the 30 years of St Gregory were added the 7 years of his younger son and successor Aristaces <sup>183</sup> and 2 of the years of the pontificate of his elder son and second successor Vrt'anēs <sup>184</sup> thus making the total of 39 years, to which the initial 17 years of Tiridates IV's reign were then added ( $17 + 30 + 7 + 2 = 56$ ). What, however, has not been taken into consideration is the fact that Aristaces was a co-pontiff with his father and predeceased him <sup>185</sup>; in other words, the 30 years of St Gregory must include the 7 years of Aristaces. As to the period of 30 years, it has furthermore been explained that there has been a confusion in the sources between two different aspects of St Gregory's activity, — his pontificate and his apostolate. The latter indeed began 30 years before his death, simultaneously with the beginning of the reign of Tiridates <sup>186</sup>, in 298, and the date 46 Tiridates for the end of St Gregory's life is simply the result of adding 30 to the first 17 years of the King's reign, which derives from the confusion in question. The death of St Gregory must, therefore, have taken place in 328 ( $298 + 30$ ); and all the sources are indeed in agreement in implying that it occurred shortly after the Council of Nicaea <sup>187</sup>.

have been about 20; when he succeeded his father Chosroes I (in 216/7) he may have been about 22/3; and he may have become the father of Chosroes II at the age of about 42. Chosroes I, father of Tiridates II, can, hypothetically, have become king (in 191) at the age of about 20; therefore, he may have been born c. 171 and become the father of Tiridates II at the age of about 23. — Cf. *infra*, nn. 209 and 211.

<sup>180</sup> Ps. MOSES, 2.91.

<sup>181</sup> Ps. MOSES, 2.92.

<sup>182</sup> ANANIAN, *Data e circ.*, pp. 350-353.

<sup>183</sup> Ps. MOSES, 2.91.

<sup>184</sup> Vrt'anēs is said to have succeeded in the 54th year of Tiridates (*ibid.*); and the latter, to have died in his 56th year of reign (*ibid.*, 2.92), i.e., in the 2nd year of the pontificate of Vrt'anēs.

<sup>185</sup> ARM. AGATHANGELUS, 123-124. 859-866; GK AGATHANGELUS, 159-161; GK LIFE, 198; ARABIC LIFE, 162-166; Ps. MOSES, 2.91; *Narratio*, 1.

<sup>186</sup> ARM. AGATHANGELUS, 5.48; GK AGATHANGELUS, 21 : in the 1st year of Tiridates; *infra*, Appendix C.

<sup>187</sup> ARM. AGATHANGELUS, 127. 884-891; GK AGATHANGELUS, 169-171; ARABIC LIFE, 186-187; Ps. MOSES, 2.89-91.

On the other hand, it is the pontificate of St Gregory that must have begun in 17 Tiridates, which is 314/5 (298 + 17). Other evidence supports this.

The *Narratio de rebus Armeniae* makes the curious assertion that the Council of Nicaea was held in 34 Tiridates IV and 20 years after the deliverance of St Gregory from his imprisonment (which is the equivalent of saying « in the 20th year of his pontificate »)<sup>188</sup>; and a little later, it dates Nicaea as A.D. 315<sup>189</sup>. In other words, in giving both the year of Grace and the number of years of St Gregory's activity, this source is 10 years short<sup>190</sup>; and one may suppose the same error to have been committed in connexion with the regnal year of Tiridates, which thus ought to be 44. However, 44 years before 325 was the year 281. It could be supposed that here was another confusion, one between years of reign and years of life, and that 44 Tiridates referred to his age. This would be in harmony with the supposition, made earlier, that his birth-date was c. 280. Another indirect confirmation may be the following. Ps. Moses, in one and the same chapter<sup>191</sup>, gives two different regnal years of the King for the beginning of St Gregory's pontificate. The opening words of that chapter place it, quite correctly, in 17 Tiridates, but a little later this event is placed in 18 Tiridates. Unless a sheer error, it can hardly be a mere variant. The date 17 Tiridates may indeed apply to 314, if one takes it to mean 16, not 17, years after 298, and that is the correct date of the consecration of St Gregory. But 18 Tiridates (= 315/6) is decidedly too late. One is tempted to conjecture another, and double, confusion: one between pontificate and apostolate and between reign and life, and to suggest that, while 17 Tiridates refers to both reign and pontificate, 18 Tiridates refers to life and apostolate. In other words, it may mean that St Gregory began his pontificate in the 17th year of the reign of Tiridates, and his apostolate in the 18th year of the King's life. All this, too, would point to the latter's birthdate as 280/1 (298-18).

<sup>188</sup> *Narratio*, I.

<sup>189</sup> *Narratio*, 34.

<sup>190</sup> The *History of the Councils* attributed to John of Ojun places Nicaea in St Gregory's 20th and in Tiridates IV's 37th year: *Book of Letters* (Tiflis, 1901), p. 221; and the *Letter of Photius* (ed. A. PAPADOPOULOS-KERAMEUS, in *Pravoslavnyj Palestinskij Sbornik*, 31 [1892]), p. 188, dates it as in 315. — I assume that these sources consider the Council of Nicaea as the *terminus ad quem* of St Gregory's active life.

<sup>191</sup> PS. MOSES, 2.91.

14. Whether or no the above considerations can establish the date of Tiridates IV's birth, is perhaps of no great moment. We do know, however, that, having been taken in his infancy to the Empire, he was brought up under the auspices of the future Emperor Licinius<sup>192</sup>. And later, together with Licinius, he took part in a war, which must be that with Iran in 297 (11), because Licinius is known to have fought in it<sup>193</sup>. Tiridates may have been about 17 at that time. Characteristically for early Armenian historiography, this war was fused in the Epos of the Iranian War with an earlier one, the war in which the Emperor Tacitus (275-276) defeated the Gothic invasion of Anatolia<sup>194</sup>. In that earlier war, another Tiridates — Tiridates III to be — may well have participated and thus supplied the onomastic grounds for the confusion; although it is perhaps difficult to see how his single combat with a Gothic king, which plays an important part in the Epos, can be regarded as anything but legendary, since he could not have been much younger than 40 at the time<sup>195</sup>. There was another similarity, besides the onomastic, in connexion with these two wars which possibly further helped the confusion. Each war was followed by the restoration of a King of Armenia on his father's throne after an interruption in the regular succession: Chosroes II was restored by Probus in 279/80, after his father had lost the throne in 252; and Tiridates IV was restored by Diocletian in 298, after his father had been murdered in 287.

<sup>192</sup> ARM. AGATHANGELUS, 3.37 (entitling Licinius «comes»); GK LIFE, 159, 183 («genral»); ARABIC LIFE, 147, 176 («patrician»).

<sup>193</sup> ARM. AGATHANGELUS, 3.41-44; GK AGATHANGELUS, 18-20. Ps. MOSES, 2.79, adduces a detail that rings true: about how Tiridates, his horse wounded in battle, swam across the Euphrates to rejoin Licinius and the defeated and fleeing Roman army; but he makes the error of placing this episode in the war of 283, after Carus had died and his son Carinus (*rectius*, Numerian: cf. ZONARAS, 12.30) been defeated by the Iranians. In actual fact, this is a memory of the defeat of Galerius in the war of 297, between Calinicus, where he had crossed the Euphrates, and Carrhae: cf. STEIN, *Hist. du Bas-Empire*, I, 79. — For Licinius's participation in the war of 297, see EUTERIUS, 10.4.

<sup>194</sup> VOPISCUS, *Tacitus*, 13.2-3; ZOSIMUS, 1.63; ZONARAS, 12.28; cf. MATTINGLY, CAH XII, 312.

<sup>195</sup> Cf. *supra*, n. 179. And yet, though difficult, not wholly impossible; cf. a similar single combat in the first Persian War of Justinian, in 527, when the Iranian champion was not a youth, but one whose hair had begun to grow grey: PROCOPIUS, *De bell. pers.*, 1.13.33-34. — At any rate, the sons of Tiridates II, who in 252 passed to the side of Iran (8), must have changed their political orientation and come under Roman protection, as indeed they had to for Chosroes II to be restored by Probus in 279/80 (10).

Having been educated in the Empire, Tiridates IV was from the Roman point of view indeed a desirable candidate for the Armenian throne; and, installed as king in 298, he proved a faithful vassal of Rome. Accordingly, in the years 303-313, he introduced in his realm Diocletian's policy of Christian persecutions. The Gregorian Cycle has preserved an unmistakable memory of this. The King is said to have issued an edict commanding fidelity to the cult of the gods, so as to ensure the prosperity and peace of his kingdom, threatening disobedience with punishment and citing similar enactments of the Emperors<sup>196</sup>; and then another one of the same tenor expressly directed against the Christians, as those who opposed that cult<sup>197</sup>. He is also said to have received Diocletian's warning against the Christians<sup>198</sup> and is, moreover, reported to have replied to the Emperor affirming his gratitude to the Romans and his fidelity to the gods<sup>199</sup>. Finally, as an integral part of this adherence to Imperial policy, came the martyrdom of St Hrip'sime, St Gaiane, and their companions<sup>200</sup>. All this throws a new — and I think, correct — light on what Eusebius of Caesarea has to tell about Maximin Daia's campaign which must have taken place in 311/2 and was directed against Armenian Christians, who would seem to have become quite numerous by this time<sup>201</sup>. This campaign appears as merely the Empire's aid

<sup>196</sup> ARM. AGATHANGELUS, 12.125-131; GK AGATHANGELUS, 57.

<sup>197</sup> ARM. AGATHANGELUS, 12.133-136; GK AGATHANGELUS, 57-58.

<sup>198</sup> ARM. AGATHANGELUS, 14.151-156; GK AGATHANGELUS, 67-68.

<sup>199</sup> GK LIFE, 40; cf. GARITTE, *Documents*, p. 293. ARM. AGATHANGELUS, 15.157-172, and GK AGATHANGELUS, 70, can also be interpreted as further evidence of Armenian co-operation with the Imperial religious policy.

<sup>200</sup> ARM. AGATHANGELUS, 16-19. 173-210; GK AGATHANGELUS, 71-88; GK LIFE, 30-50; ARABIC LIFE, 10-37.

<sup>201</sup> EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA, *Historia ecclesiastica*, 9.8 :

τῷ τυράννῳ ὁ πρὸς Ἀρμενίου πόλεμος, ἄνδρας ἐξ ἀρχαίου φίλους τε καὶ συμμάχους Ῥωμαίων, οὓς καὶ αὐτοὺς χριστιανούς ὄντας καὶ τὴν εἰς τὸ θεῖον εὐσέβειαν διὰ σπουδῆς ποιουμένους ὁ θεομισῆς εἰδώλοισι θύειν καὶ δαίμοσιν ἐπαγαγκάσαι πεπειραμένους, ἐχθροὺς ἀντὶ φίλων καὶ πολεμίους ἀντὶ συμμάχων κατεστήσατο... Αὐτὸς μὲν οὖν περὶ τὸν πρὸς Ἀρμενίου πόλεμον ἅμα τοῖς αὐτοῦ στρατοπέδοις κατεπονεῖτο... Some historians (beginning with Duchesne) have thought that this intervention concerned only the Syrian March, i.e., the former Kingdom of Sophene, or all of the *regiones transtigritanae*, i.e., also the Arabian March (cf. *supra*, n. 162), cf. ANANIAN, *Data e circ.*, pp. 344-346. We cannot go here into the question of the beginnings of Armenian Christianity, i.e., the question of the Syrian missions and of whether the mid-third-century Bishop Meruzanes (= Meruzan) of



to its Armenian ally in his enforcement of the common policy directed against the common enemy. Quite rightly has the martyrdom of the Hrip'simians been placed by Fr Peeters in this particular context <sup>202</sup>.

St Gregory began his apostolic labours in 298, but came to a clash with the King from the start, some 5 years before the beginning of the Persecutions, and was imprisoned <sup>203</sup>. Whatever the exaggerations in the account of the tortures to which he was subjected, the fact of his imprisonment is difficult to doubt. It lasted — and here the sources are at variance — from 13 to 15 years <sup>204</sup>. This means that his release came sometime between 312 and 314. And it was then, with the Roman government embarked upon the new religious policy of toleration, and even favour, with regard to Christianity, that the royal Armenian government underwent a change of attitude towards the Armenian Christians, whose strength apparently could not be ignored. It was then that the conversion of the King of Armenia took place and was followed by the episcopal consecration of St Gregory at Caesarea in 314, and the subsequent Christianization of Armenia. The date 314 for these momentous events has been sufficiently proved by Manandian and Ananian to require any further comment here.

St Gregory's elder son Vrt'anēs was the successor of his father and of the latter's co-pontiff and younger son Aristaces <sup>205</sup>; and Tiridates

Eusebius of Caesarea, 6.46.2, was in the Syrian March (cf., e.g., ADONTZ, *Armenija*, p. 347) or in Lesser Armenia (cf., e.g., TOURNEBIZE, *Hist. pol. rel.*, pp. 420-421); but the fact of importance for us, in this context, is that Tiridates *did* persecute Christians in Great Armenia, which means that they had become sufficiently numerous there by the end of the third or the beginning of the fourth century. Fr Ananian is right in stating (p. 346) that Maximin's campaign was directed not against Armenia, as a State, but against Armenians, i.e., some Armenians: precisely the Armenian Christians. His bias doubtless obliged Eusebius of Caesarea to exaggerate, as when he sees in this campaign a violation of Armenia's status as friend and ally of Rome or when he speaks of the defeats of Maximin (cf. STEIN, *Hist. du Bas-Empire*, I, 456 n. 125). But, whatever the exaggerations, this story shows that the Armenian Christians were not only numerous, but also sufficiently strong to offer resistance to persecution. This factor may have played a role in the subsequent acceptance of Christianity by the Armenian State.

<sup>202</sup> PEETERS, *S. Grégoire ... dans le calendrier de Naples* (*supra*, n. 13), pp. 105-106; *L'intervention de Constance II*, p. 238.

<sup>203</sup> ARM. AGATHANGELUS, 5-11.48-124; GK AGATHANGELUS, 21-56; GK LIFE, 1-29; ARABIC LIFE, 1-9.

<sup>204</sup> ARM. AGATHANGELUS, 11.124 (13 years); GK AGATHANGELUS, 56 (14 years); GK LIFE, 54, 136, 183 (15 years); ARABIC LIFE, 8, 39, 124, 176 (15 years).

<sup>205</sup> FAUSTUS, 3.3; PS. MOSES, 2.91.

IV died in the second year of his pontificate <sup>206</sup>. It has been seen above (13) that St Gregory's apostolate of 30 years' duration and beginning in 298 was confused with his pontificate, beginning in 17 Tiridates IV (= 314), and that, because of this confusion, extra 17 years were added to the King's reign as well as the extra 7 years of Aristaces which, together with the 2 years from the pontificate of Vrt'anēs, made that reign last for 56 years. Without the extra 17 and the extra 7 years, the reign of Tiridates IV appears to have lasted 32 years, i.e., from 298 to 330. Indeed the sources imply that King Tiridates died shortly after St Gregory <sup>207</sup>. If it be assumed that Tiridates was born c. 280/1, he must have died at the age of about 50 or 49. This may explain why, confusing life and reign, the *Primary History* assigns to him 48 years of rule <sup>208</sup>.

15. To complete this chronological and genealogical commentary, the following additional evidence may be adduced here. Leontius of Ruisi records the overthrow in 189 of Amazaspus (Amazasp) II (185-189), last King of the Third Pharnabazid Dynasty of Iberia, by Rev I the Just (189-216), son of the King of Armenia by Amazaspus II's sister, daughter of King Pharasmanes (P'arsman) III of Iberia (135-185) <sup>209</sup>. Rev could only have been another son of Vologases II and a younger brother of Chosroes I. Since he came to Iberia while Vologases was King of Armenia, and not yet Great King, Rev the Just was remembered as the King of Armenia's son. A confirmation of his parentage may be found in his sobriquet (*mart'ali*, in Georgian), which is an obvious rendering of δίκαιος, one of the most favoured epithets — along with εὐεργέτης and φιλέλλην — that were used in

<sup>206</sup> *Supra*, n. 184.

<sup>207</sup> Ps. MOSES, 2.92; FAUSTUS, 3.2 (death of St. Gregory), 3 (immediately thereafter: the accession of Chosroes III, which implies the intervening death of Tiridates IV); the Gregorian Cycle ends with the death of St Gregory.

<sup>208</sup> *Prim. Hist.*, p. 16.

<sup>209</sup> *Hist. Iber.*, p. 58. For the dates of these Kings of Iberia, see my *Chron. of the Early Kings of Iberia*, NN° 15-17. Pharasmanes III appears to have had a son with him on his visit to Rome c. 154. Presuming that his daughter was born about that time and that she was about 15 when she married Vologases, the marriage may have taken place c. 169. And, indeed, the birth-date of Chosroes I of Armenia can, for other reasons, be set hypothetically at c. 171 (*supra*, n. 179). Rev, his younger brother (for, unquestionably, the throne of Armenia would have been reserved for an elder Arsacid prince), may have been born c. 172/3 and thus come to the throne of Iberia at the age of about 16 or 17.

their *intitulatio* by the Arsacid Great Kings, including Vologases IV<sup>210</sup>. This is interesting also as providing the information as to who Vologases IV/II's wife and, presumably, Chosroes I's mother was. According to the same Leontius, Rev II, co-King (345-361) with his father, Meribanes (Mirian) III the first Christian King of Iberia (284-361), was married to Salome, daughter of Tiridates the Great<sup>211</sup>.

16. In conclusion, the foregoing can be summed up in the following

### CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF THE THIRD-CENTURY ARMENIAN ARSACIDS

- a. Vologases II 180-191 (Iranian vassal)
- b. Chosroes I (son) 191-216/7 (Iranian vassal 191-197, 200-216/7, Roman vassal 197-200)
- c. Tiridates II (son) 216/7-252 (Iranian vassal 216/7-217, 244-252, Roman vassal 217-244)

#### *Arsacids dispossessed, replaced by Sassanids*

- d. Hormisdas-Artasir (Artavasdes) 252-271 (Iranian vassal)
- e. Narses (brother) c. 273-279/80 (Iranian vassal)

#### *Armenia divided, Arsacids restored in the West*

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| West Armenia (Roman vassals)  | East Armenia (Iranian vassal)  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>f. Chosroes II (son of Tiridates II) 279/80-287</li> <li>g. Tiridates III (brother) 287-293</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>e. Narses 279/80-293</li> </ul> |

<sup>210</sup> Cf., e.g., B.V. HEAD, *Historia numorum* (Oxford, 1911), pp. 819-822; CHRISTENSEN, *Iran Sass.*, p. 49.

<sup>211</sup> *Chron. of the Early Kings of Iberia*, No 22a. Leontius shows her married to Rev already before the arrival of St Nino in Iberia, A.D. 324 (*Studies*, p. 377) : *Hist. Iber.*, p. 70. Since she must have been at least 15 then, her birth-date may be set hypothetically at c. 309 (when Tiridates IV was about 28). Salome played a role in the Conversion of Iberia, A.D. 337 (*Studies*, p. 377) : *Hist. Iber.*, p. 121 etc. One of her sons was named Tiridates, in honour, obviously, of her father : *ibid.*, p. 137. — In this connexion, Herzfeld fell into a curious error. First, he mistakenly identified Meribanes/Mirian III of Iberia with the Iranian Vitaxa Pāpak, mentioned in the Paikuli Inscription : *Paikuli*, pp. 50, 78, 155, 229-230, 245; cf. *Studies*, p. 159 n. 35 and p. 190 n. 195. Next, confusing Mirian with his son and Tiridates III with Tiridates IV, he spoke of the Vitaxa Pāpak as son-in-law of the King Tirdāt of the Paikuli inscription : *Paikuli*, p. 245.

*Armenia reunited*

- g. Tiridates III 293-298 (Roman vassal in the West, Iranian vassal in the East)  
 h. Tiridates IV the Great (*son of Chosroes II*) 298-330 (Roman vassal).

Georgetown University

Cyril TOUMANOFF.

## APPENDIX A

*Résumé of the Chronological Errors in the History  
 of Ps. Moses Relating to the Period under Discussion\**

- 2.71 : Chosroes goes, belatedly, to the aid of Artabanus V [c. 213-c. 227] and asks the Emperor Philip [244-249] for aid.  
 2.72 : With Philip's aid, Chosroes defeats Artasir [224-241], puts him to flight, and wrests Assyria from him.  
 2.73 : The Emperor Philip [244-249] is succeeded by Decius, Gallus, and Valerian [249-260], while Chosroes triumphs over Artasir [224-241] pursuing him to India.  
 2.74 : Chosroes is murdered at the instigation of Artasir, after 48 years of reign.  
 2.75 : Chosroes is neutral while Caracalla [211-217] wages war on the Great King Vologases V. [This chronologically exact chapter is obviously taken from a different source, called by Ps. Moses Firmilian of Caesarea].  
 2.76 : After the murder of Chosroes the Armenian Princes appeal to the Emperor Valerian [253-260], who fails to arrive in time to save Armenia. He is succeeded by Claudius [268-270] and Aurelian [270-275]; then Tacitus [275-276] and his brothers reign. Then Artasir [224-241] invades Armenia. Tacitus encounters Artasir and is defeated.

\* Unlike the Synchronistic Table (Appendix B), which patently uses names like, e.g., Artasir, to designate, as it were symbolically, any Great King, Ps. Moses leaves no doubt that his Artasir, Sapor, and Hormisdas are in fact the Great Kings Artasir (c. 224 - c. 241), Sapor I (c. 241-271), and Hormisdas I-Artasir (271-272/3) : *supra*, nn. 37-39.

- 2.77 : Probus [276-281] and Artāšir [224-241] make peace and divide Armenia. After the latter, his son Sapor [I, 241-271] reigns for 1 year before the accession of Tiridates.
- 2.79 : Tiridates's *geste* in the Empire. Probus [276-281] wars on the Goths, then Carus [281-283] wars on Iran, but he and his son Carinus are defeated by Artāšir [224-241]. Tiridates takes part in this war, as well as Licinius. Diocletian becomes Emperor [284].
- 2.82 : Tiridates becomes King of Armenia in the 3rd year of Diocletian [287]
- 2.84 : Tiridates arrives in Armenia, marries Ašxēn; at the same time takes place the wedding at Nicomedia of Diocletian's daughter Maximina with Constantine, son of Constantius [i.e., wedding in 293 of Diocletian's daughter with Galerius and Maximin's step-daughter with Constantius].
- 2.84 : Sapor [I, 241-271] is at peace and Tiridates goes to see Constantine [306-337].
- 2.89 : Constantine [306-337] invites Tiridates to the Council of Nicaea [325]; but Sapor [I, 241-271] entrusts the command of his troops to Narses, who later reigns for 9 years [293-302], and to Hormizd, who later reigns for 3 years [271-272/3], for a possible attack on Armenia; so Aristaces is sent to the Council.

## APPENDIX B.

### *Résumé of the Synchronistic Table in Eusebius (Sebeos), History, cap. II, Relating to the Period under Discussion.*

These synchronisms, for the most part triple and occasionally given twice in succession, are exact for the period which is the subject of this study. However, it is to be borne in mind that : 1) a regnal year may mean a year after the accession of a king already deceased; 2) dates based on regnal years must be allowed at least a one-year variation; and 3) the Sassanid royal names of Chosroes and Artāšir are used here for Great Kings bearing other *praenomina*, the former being used (as « Chosroes the Great » sometimes) for the outstanding Great King Sapor I, the latter for other Great Kings.

## I.

pp. 20-21

3 [Aur]elian	$(270 + 3 =)$	273
31 Chosroes the Great* [Sapor I]	$(241 + 31 =)$	274
1 Artāšīr [Bahrām I]	$(272/3 + 1 =)$	273/4
change of kingship**		

\* erroneously called King of Armenia

\*\* must refer to the replacement by Bahrām I of the succession foreseen by Sapor I, in 272/3

## II.

p. 21

34 Chosroes the Great [Sapor I]	$(241 + 34 =)$	275
4 Artāšīr [Hormisdas-Artāšīr or Bahrām I]	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (271 + 4 =) \\ (272/3 + 4 =) \end{array} \right.$	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} 275 \\ 276/8 \end{array} \right.$
6 Terentianus ( <i>sic</i> ) [Aurelian]	$(270 + 6 =)$	276

## III.

35 Chosroes*		
5 Artāšīr [Bahrām II]	$(275/6 + 5 =)$	280/1
6 Probus	$(276 + 6 =)$	282
35 Chosroes [Sapor I]	$(241 + 35 =)$	276
5 Artāšīr [Bahrām I]	$(272/3 + 5 =)$	277/8
1 Probus	$(276 + 1 =)$	277

\* In the synchronisms for 277, 35 Chosroes corresponds to 5 Artāšīr, i.e., Bahrām I; but in the synchronisms for 281/2, the compiler, being, obviously, unaware of the fact that this time Artāšīr symbolized another Bahrām, repeated the same equivalence: 35 Chosroes = 5 Artāšīr.

## IV.

41 Chosroes the Great [Sapor I]	$(241 + 41 =)$	282
11 Artāšīr [Hormisdas I-Artāšīr]	$(271 + 11 =)$	282
Carus becomes Emperor*		[281]

41 Chosroes [Sapor I]	(241 + 41 =)	282
11 Artāšīr [Hormisdas I-Artāšīr]	(271 + 11 =)	282
1 Carus	(281 + 1 =)	282

\* with his sons Carinus and Numerian, for 7 years, which is an error.

## V.

48[42]* Chosroes [Sapor I]	(241 + 42 =)	283
18[12]* Artāšīr [Hormisdas I-Artāšīr]	(271 + (12) =)	283
Carus wars in Mesopotamia, etc.		[283]

\* The erroneous regnal years 48 and 18 are due to the copyist's omission of a stroke, whereby  $\rho$  (2) became  $\pi$  (8).

## VI.

p. 22

22* Diocletian		
48[42]** Chosroes [Sapor I]	(241 + 42 =)	283
18[12]** Artāšīr [Hormisdas I-Artāšīr]	(271 + 12 =)	283
1 Diocletian	(284 + 1 =)	284/5

\* error, contradicted by the second mention of Diocletian

\*\* the same error, due to the copyist's omission of a stroke, as in V.

## VII.

21* Artāšīr		
4 Diocletian	(284 + 4 =)	287/8
murder of Chosroes II of Armenia		[287]
11 Artāšīr [Bahrām II]	(275/6 + 11 =)	286/7
4 Diocletian	(284 + 4 =)	287/8
Artāšīr reigns in Armenia for		
11 years**		[287-298]

\* error, contradicted by the second mention of Artāšīr

\*\* found in S. Malxasyan's ed. of Eusebius (Erevan,

1939), p. 15 (cap. III, in that ed.), but not in the 1913 Tiflis ed.

## VIII.

p. 22-23

30\* Artasir

15 Diocletian (284 + 15 =) 298/9

Tiridates becomes King of  
Armenia\*\*

[298]

32[22]\*\*\* Artasir [Bahrām II] (275/6 + 22 =) 297/8

15 Diocletian (284 + 15 =) 298/9

1 Tiridates (298 + 1 =) 298/9

\* error, contradicted by the second mention of  
Artasir

\*\* and is said, erroneously, to reign for 70 years

\*\*\* writing 32 for the correct 22 must be due to a  
copyist's omission of a stroke in *h*(20) which made it  
look like *l*(30).

## IX.

p. 23

9 Tiridates (298 + 9 =) 307

1 Constantine\* (306 + 1 =) 307

9 Tiridates (298 + 9 =) 307

\* erroneously Constantine is said to have built  
« Byzantium » in 9 years.

Thereafter the information becomes thoroughly confused.

## APPENDIX C.

*Two Chronological Indications in the History of Eusebius (Sebeōs)*

There are in Eusebius two chronological indications which may possibly further confirm the date 298 for the beginning of the reign of Tiridates IV the Great and of St Gregory's apostolic labours. They are found in the letter written by the Armenians in reply to the Emperor



Constans II's unionist proposals, which is cited in cap. 33 of his *History* (Tiflis, 1913).

1) It is stated that the Armenians received their faith through « St Gregory's preaching to King Tiridates and the Princes of the land of Armenia, about 30 years before Constantine »: (գրգղէ էթէ Լ ամաւք յառջ քան զԿոստանդիանոս): p. 206. 2) Somewhat later (p. 211), it is said that in the thirteenth year of Our Saviour, « Diocletian reigns with three associates in the kingdom of the Romans ». Then follows a mention of the Persecutions, and after that the statement that Constantius I died [306] in his 75th year (the exact age of Constantius I is not known, but he must have been younger than 75 when he died).

The phrase « about 30 years before Constantine » is vague. If it refers to his accession, the year 276 (306-30) must be meant; if to his death, the year 307 (337-30). Neither date makes sense. May it not refer, then, to an outstanding event of Constantine's reign? There were two: the adoption of Christianity and the foundation of Constantinople. The latter — building of « Byzantium » — is in fact found (misplaced) among the synchronisms in the Synchronistic Table, IX (Appendix B). It may well be referred to here. Now there are three dates for this event: its foundation in 324, its inauguration in 330, and its « consecration » in 328 (with the raising of a porphyry column surmounted by a statue of Constantine as Helios: Stein, *Hist. du Bas-Empire*, I, 480 n. 192). Subtracting 30, we obtain 296, 300, and 298, the last being precisely the date when Tiridates IV began to reign and St Gregory to preach. The year 328 is, incidentally, also the year of St Gregory's death, 30 years after the beginning of his apostolate. Most likely, however, the entire period of 324-330 is referred to, and this would account for the expression « about 30 years ». Compression and telescoping are, of course, in evidence here, as the beginning of the apostolate is fused with its successful completion.

It has been suggested (cf. Ananian, *Data e circ.*, p. 50) that the 13th year of Our Saviour should be considered as that of the Era of the Romans (for which, see Grumel, *La Chronologie*, pp. 146-151), beginning with the year 248/9, which terminated the first millenary of Rome. However, it is difficult to see why this era should have been referred to as the era « of Our Saviour ». Surely, something more appropriately religious might be expected. And such more appropriate era did in fact exist, — the so-called Era of the Martyrs, which dis-

guised the Era of Diocletian (Grumel, pp. 36-37). Since it begins in 284/5, its 13th year falls in 297/8, — once again the year of the beginning of Tiridates the Great's reign and of St Gregory's apostolic labours.

One can only conjecture as to what was at the basis of these two chronological indications. It is very likely that Eusebius, or his source, had access to a collection of synchronistic notices, like the one given at the beginning of his History (Appendix B); and that that collection contained entries like these :

30 years before Constantine built « Byzantium »  
St Gregory preaches to King Tiridates  
13th year of the Era of the Martyrs (« of Our Saviour »)  
Diocletian reigns with associates.

Accordingly, the first two entries may have been used when reference was made to St Gregory's preaching; the last two, when it was question of Diocletian, a little further on in the text. And the fact that the Era of Diocletian had become disguised as the Era of the Martyrs may have created the occasional impression that the Persecutions began before the year 303.

January, 1968.  
Georgetown University,  
Washington.

Cyrille TOUMANOFF.